

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06422 234 0

GOVT. DOC.

FRAGILE

DO NOT  
PHOTOCOPY



ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE  
BOARD OF ELECTION  
COMMISSIONERS

FOR THE  
YEAR 1899



BOSTON  
MUNICIPAL PRINTING OFFICE  
1900



ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

BOARD OF ELECTION  
COMMISSIONERS

FOR THE

YEAR 1899



BOSTON

MUNICIPAL PRINTING OFFICE

1900

Tracy County Election Commission  
Box 744



BOSTON, February 15, 1900.

HON. THOMAS N. HART,

*Mayor of the City of Boston :*

SIR, — In compliance with the requirements of section 24, of chapter 3 of the Revised Ordinances, the Board of Election Commissioners respectfully submits its annual report for the year 1899.

At the beginning of the year the figures submitted by us to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment as our estimated requirements for the year were based upon the probability of an unusually heavy registration, owing to the fact that the contest for the mayoralty nomination, particularly in one of the two leading political parties, would bring out a large number of voters at the caucuses, and the experience of this department warranted us in assuming that as the registration increased so the cost of carrying on the department became greater. Though the amount allowed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment was \$9,500 less than our figures, it was our good fortune to carry on the department, not only within the amount allowed, but to have a substantial balance left to our credit, as was the case also the preceding year. This result was brought about only by exercising great care in our expenditures and it has been demonstrated to our satisfaction that the additional demands upon this office in the years of heavy registration can be met successfully without

a great increase in the office force. The supplementary registration was very heavy in September, owing to the Act of 1898, chapter 548, section 20, which provides that there shall be no supplementary assessment after October first. During the month of September the registration was done entirely at the central office, and for most of that month the office was kept open, in connection with the assessors' office, until ten o'clock in the evening in response to the claim that many of those seeking to be assessed and registered had neither the time nor opportunity to attend to it during the day. It may be thought advisable in the future to provide places for evening registration in co-operation with the Assessing Department in the different wards during September to relieve the central office. If such places are provided, the number of evenings usually provided for registration in the different wards prior to the State and City elections may be reduced, so that no additional expenditure will be necessary to make such provision.

The number of male voters on the first printed list made up from the assessors' returns to this department was 84,967. There were 15,524 names added prior to the State election and 2,334 names added before the city election making after the necessary revision the total number of male voters registered for the city election 102,875, thus exceeding the similar registration in 1897 of 102,473, which up to that time was the largest in the history of the city. At the city election in 1897 79,763 votes were cast for mayor, and in 1899 81,341 votes were cast for the same office, the latter being the highest number of votes cast in this city for mayor. In 1896 out of the total registration of 96,746 male voters 82,198 votes were cast for president and 80,405 votes for governor. There was no mayor elected that year so the comparison of votes cast cannot be further extended.

#### CAUCUSES AND ELECTIONS.

The Act of 1899, chapter 346, regulating the holding of caucuses reduced the number of caucuses held in Boston from seven to four for the two leading political parties. The separate caucuses for choosing a ward and city committee, and the separate caucuses for the nomination of candidates for representatives to the General Court and for the Common Council are no longer held as formerly by one of the two leading political parties, but their nominations are made at one or the other of the two regular caucuses. The interval between the State and City elections is so short that in order to comply with the requirements of law with regard to issuing the call for caucuses prior to the city election, and with



regard to filing certificates of nomination and nomination papers, the caucuses of the two leading political parties were held in the past year on successive evenings in the same place, and created some embarrassment in making proper arrangements for the caucuses held on the second evening. In two wards the votes cast in the caucuses on the first evening were not counted until the afternoon of the second day, and in one of these wards the caucus officers had not completed the count and return of votes cast until nearly two hours after the time fixed for the beginning of the second caucus. This condition of affairs could have been prevented by agreement of the two parties not to call their caucuses on successive evenings, but in the absence of any such agreement, without a change in the law the same embarrassment is likely to arise again.

The Socialist Labor party having established itself as a political party in accordance with law, by the vote cast for its candidate for governor in 1898, held caucuses for the first time during the past year. On account of failure to comply with the provisions of law, no caucuses were held by this party prior to the State election, but a call was seasonably issued for caucuses in all the wards of the city prior to the City election, and suitable and convenient places were provided by us for holding such caucuses. In some of the wards it was understood by us, and it proved to be the case, that no nominations were to be made, yet it became necessary to provide a blank ballot in such cases, and to equip the polling places as if a caucus were to be held. No ballots were cast in these wards, and we submit that some change in the law should be made whereby it will be necessary to provide polling places only in such wards where nominations are made and printed on a ballot furnished by this department, notwithstanding the original call for the caucuses included all the wards.

In addition to the caucuses and elections above referred to, a caucus and election were held in the Thirteenth Suffolk Representative District, to fill a vacancy caused by the death, previous to the meeting of the Legislature, of the candidate chosen at the State election.

The caucus officers have as a rule performed their work satisfactorily, and the conduct of the caucuses shows from year to year a great improvement. Unusually large caucuses were held the past year, and the returns generally were prompt and accurate. Whether any further improvement could be accomplished by providing compensation for such officers, is a matter worthy of serious consideration.

It is claimed that where such officers are paid voluntarily

by the ward committees better service is given. If the law required that some compensation should be paid to such officers, either by the political parties or by the city, it would undoubtedly be welcome to such as already perform their whole duty, and perhaps secure greater efficiency throughout the city.

The election officers, too, have generally served the city faithfully and well the past year. In each of the 191 precincts in the city we appointed a warden, clerk and four inspectors, representing equally the two leading political parties, and 1,146 such officers were appointed and qualified, after being gathered together in different sections of the city to be instructed as to their duties. With so large a number it is not surprising that a few cases of dereliction of duty should arise, but these are dealt with summarily. Two election officers were discharged during the past year during the progress of the election, as their conduct and condition were such as to disqualify them from further service, and one officer who was nominated from the floor to fill a vacancy was removed upon complaint, which was sustained, that he was not affiliated with the political party which he was chosen to represent. As against these cases of malfeasance in the discharge of their duty, it can be said that the great majority of our election officers, many of whom serve from year to year, are loyal to the public and to the party which they represent, and their work is uniformly characterized by promptness, honesty and accuracy. In addition to the six election officers regularly appointed to serve in each precinct, the same number of deputies are also appointed in accordance with law, and we experienced some difficulty in securing the presence of these deputies prior to the election in order that they might be instructed as to their duties and sworn to faithfully and impartially discharge the same, which is necessary before they are entitled to receive compensation for their services. As very few of them are called upon to fill the places of regulars at the elections, the great majority of those who qualify receive one dollar and fifty cents for reporting at the opening of the polls, which is the only duty required of them.

Our opinion previously expressed that these deputy election officers should be dispensed with and the money now paid them saved is strengthened by the experience of the department the past year.

The difference in the number of male voters in the several precincts has become so great as to call for some change in the existing conditions. The ward lines will be changed again in five years, but the precinct lines should be changed at once,

if additional precincts are not deemed advisable. With the 191 existing precincts the average of male voters based upon the registration at the city election of 102,875 would be 539. The number of voters in the precincts varies from 863 to 234, while 104 precincts contain less than 539 male voters and 87 precincts over that number. We are of the opinion that if enough additional precincts were provided to make the whole number 250 the best results would be accomplished; with the registration at the present figures there would then be an average of 411 voters in each precinct, and this number would ensure a more prompt return of votes cast. The rapid growth and development of the suburban wards have caused them to exceed greatly the number of voters in most of the old wards; and by an examination of the tables in the following pages it will be noticed that there is a wide variance in the number of voters in each ward, the highest number being 5,915 and the lowest 2,730. This would seem to warrant an immediate change in the ward lines if such a course were authorized by law.

#### ELECTION BOOTHS AND POLLING PLACES.

In our last annual report we stated at some length the reasons which made it necessary to purchase one hundred voting booths made of thin corrugated steel, and we then admitted that the severe test given these booths at the city election in December, 1898, when the weather was unusually trying and the temperature at zero, proved conclusively that they were not adapted for use in such weather as is likely to occur at the time of the city election. The matter of making them comfortable at such times was considered, and it was decided to have the sides and top lined with thin wooden sheathing, and we believe they are now so equipped as to fully and satisfactorily answer the purpose for which they were built, although the weather at the last city election was mild and afforded no opportunity for a thorough test. The expense of making this change was greater than we expected, but was largely covered by the amount received the past year from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for moving, fitting up and repairing the old wooden booths belonging to this department which were loaned in 1898 during the war with Spain for the use of the State troops enlisting into the service of the government. Until we are again allowed the use of the school buildings for polling places the public must be contented with the accommodations and facilities offered by these booths.

## RECOUNTS.

The reduction in the number of caucuses held in this city by one of the leading political parties before referred to has reduced somewhat the number of petitions for recounts of votes cast at caucuses, but there has been no falling off in the number of petitions for recounts of votes cast at elections.

On the whole such recounts have been conducted with little friction, and apparently to the satisfaction of all parties. Owing to the other demands upon the office at the busy season and the limited office force it has been necessary to recount votes on the Sabbath day on two occasions much to our regret and annoyance. We hope it will not again be necessary to do this. In 1898 a change was made in conducting the general recount after the city election by securing a large and well lighted hall in the immediate vicinity of our offices, and employing an extra force of skilled clerks that the work might be more quickly done than in the small and poorly ventilated room connected with our offices where such recounts had been previously conducted. So successful were the results that we conducted the general recount after the last city election in the same hall which had sufficient floor space to allow the placing of fifteen tables, at each of which two clerks were assigned representing the two leading political parties. We were enabled also to accommodate the large number of candidates interested by giving them full representation, and we believe that until the law is changed so that some limitation shall be placed upon the right to petition for a recount the method of conducting a general recount of the votes of the city, thus followed by us, is the one which gives the greatest satisfaction to the public, and accomplishes the best results.

The abuse of the right to petition for a recount does not diminish. Numerous petitions are filed, signed by the ten required voters, who make oath to the truth of their petition which sets forth that a recount would affect the result, whereas in truth and in fact the margin is so great that no such change could naturally be expected. As the recount progresses, it is found that an inspection of the ballots, particularly of caucus ballots, is only desired, and by the admission of interested parties present it is evident that there is no expectation that the result will be changed. If a penalty were imposed by statute upon petitioners in such cases we believe that the abuse above set forth would be greatly modified.

Nine complaints for illegal registration were filed with this department during the past year, and but two com-

plaints in 1898, which would indicate that the lists of voters as prepared by us on the whole contain only such names as are entitled to be placed thereon. Of the nine complaints in 1899, in two cases no warrant was issued, as the evidence submitted was deemed insufficient. In the remaining seven cases warrants were issued, and after hearings conducted in accordance with the new method of procedure established by the Legislature of 1898, five of these complaints were dismissed, in two instances from the failure of the complaining parties to further prosecute. The evidence in two cases was adjudged sufficient, and the names were stricken from the lists. We again urge the passage of a law which shall give the complainants in this class of cases authority to summon witnesses, and an adequate penalty should be attached to the failure to respond to such summons.

During the past year objections in writing were filed with us as the Ballot Law Commission of the city of Boston in seven cases, all of which were objections to the nominations of aldermanic candidates. We were called upon to hear and determine four of these cases, objections in the other three being withdrawn before reached. Of the cases heard three were unanimously decided adversely to the objectors, and in one case the designation of the candidate was adjudged not to be within the statute and the objections were sustained and the name of the candidate was not printed on the ballot.

#### JURORS.

The system of preparing the jury list by this Board was set forth at length in our report last year, and certain suggestions were made which, in our opinion, if carried out, would be an improvement on the present system. It is our aim to prepare a list which shall contain men of the character and intelligence desired for such service, and we exercise great care in the selection, and during the past year we have received no complaint that the jurors drawn for service had not the requisite qualifications, which is some evidence that the present system works well. We agree with the Attorney-General that the exempted class is too large, and are inclined to join in his opinion that if the term of service were further reduced, active business men who object to serving on the jury, but whose experience and judgment especially fit them for such service would be less incommoded. It is claimed, too, that a large number of our intelligent citizens do not register as voters because they wish to escape jury service. A partial remedy for this would be to prepare the

jury list from the list of assessed polls, but we see so many objections to the latter course that we cannot recommend any such change.

Under the law a person who is drawn and serves is exempt for three years, but there is no requirement that clerks of courts send to us the names of jurors who actually serve. Our practice is therefore to follow the list of persons drawn sent to us by the city clerk and mark such names as exempt for three years. It is known that some of those drawn do not report on account of temporary illness, or for some other good cause, and others are excused by the Court for reasons then judged sufficient, but who might be required to serve at another time. The law could be more strictly administered by us if the names of persons serving were thus submitted to us.

A few changes in the law have been suggested in the preceding pages, but in no instance do we believe the public would suffer greatly if the suggestions were not acted upon immediately. The laws regarding caucuses and elections are now fairly understood, and in the main are working well. If the Election Act of 1898 is to be further amended or modified it should be done, in our opinion, only when serious defects are discovered in the operation of the law which can be remedied only by new legislation. In this connection we desire to cite a few additional instances of defects in the law which have come to our attention during the past year.

At the caucus in one of the wards prior to the city election two lists of delegates to the mayoralty convention appeared on the ballot as pledged to the same candidate while the candidate of the opposition had one delegation only. It was claimed, and from the evidence disclosed at the recount, the claim seemed to be justified, that but one of the two delegates pledged to the same candidate was filed by the supporters of that candidate, while the other was filed with the intention of confusing and deceiving the voters and thereby secure the election of the delegation pledged to the opposing candidate. If such were the purpose the scheme was successfully carried out. A bill is pending before the Legislature (House No. 245) to allow the person, to whom such a delegation is described as pledged or favorable, the right to have such designation or description stricken from the nomination papers before the ballot is printed. If this bill should become a law the relief desired would be accomplished.

The district system of electing aldermen provided by chapter 355 of the Acts of 1899 became operative the past year, and the contests for the caucus nominations in several

of the districts were very warm. Following the caucuses numerous nomination papers in the interest of independent candidates were circulated for the required signatures and then filed with us that the number of legal voters appearing thereon might be certified. The papers were then returned to the persons filing the same or their duly authorized representatives and when the required number of legal voters was obtained, the nomination papers were finally filed with this department. On the last day provided for filing nomination papers prior to the city election one of these papers which had been duly certified was returned to the person who said he had filed the same, and who signed in a book provided for the purpose the name of the person who was the filer of the paper. It appeared almost immediately thereafter that the paper had been obtained by fraud, but the culprit had disappeared, and in the crowded condition of the office at the time an accurate description of him could not be given the police who were called upon to apprehend the criminal, and any possible accomplices. Though suspicion pointed to certain persons we were unable to procure sufficient evidence to warrant an arrest. The would-be candidate who was thus defrauded petitioned for the right to have his name placed on the official ballot, but under the circumstances, though anxious to do so, after careful inquiry, we decided we could not grant the relief desired in the premises. Hereafter in addition to the usual precautions taken against such deceit we shall give a receipt to the person so filing a nomination paper for certification of the signatures, and shall return the paper only on presentation of the receipt or to the candidate in person if he is known to us. We believe such a practice will prevent a similar occurrence, and do not consider that any legislation on the subject is called for.

A practice of filing independent nomination papers containing the same surname as that of the candidate nominated at the caucus has arisen, and if these papers are not filed in good faith, but if as is claimed, for the sole purpose of defeating the regular candidate, we believe it to be an abuse of the law which should be remedied. If objections to such independent nomination papers for candidates to be voted for at the city election were made before this Board sitting as the Ballot Law Commission on the grounds above set forth it could be determined whether the statute defining the duties of the Commission were broad enough to consider such objections. If the statute does not confer such power it would seem advisable to have it so amended that the regular nominated candidate may not be defeated by any such questionable practice.

The same Christian name as well as surname, it is claimed, also, has been used for the purpose mentioned above, which is even a more objectionable feature of this practice.

It has been found that the operation of section 128 of the Election Act of 1898, which provides for the appointment by this Board of additional caucus officers, has not in most cases accomplished the results desired. Instead of the faction in the party without representation behind the rail obtaining these officers the drawing by lot has often given a majority of these five additional caucus officers in each ward to the faction in control of the rail. Yet we believe a further trial of the law should be given rather than to repeal a statute so recently enacted.

Two important matters of great interest to the public are before the Legislature, and we hope will receive serious consideration. The holding of primary elections has for some time been favored by many on the ground that it would cure existing abuses of the caucus laws. If but one caucus should be held prior to the State election and one caucus before the city election at which all political parties shall select candidates there would be a substantial saving of expense to the city. The details of such a new system, such as the printing of a single ballot or separate ballots for each political party, the selection of officers to preside and conduct the caucus and the proper safeguards to regulate the enrolment of the voters with the different parties are matters to be deliberately considered and passed upon only after such careful consideration.

The proposition to change the system of placing the names of candidates for the same office now placed alphabetically on the official ballot at caucuses and elections is one in which the public have a deep interest. There is no doubt but that the names having the first places on the ballot receive an undue advantage on this account. A bill is before the Legislature providing that in this city the arrangement of names on the ballots in elections shall be decided by lot, the drawing to take place under the direction of this Board in the presence of the different candidates, and if such a change is desired by the public it seems to us an entirely feasible proposition.

There have been several changes in the Board during the past year. In October, 1899, Hon. Joseph J. Corbett, in accordance with a fixed determination of many months' standing, resigned as a member of the Board. The resignation of Mr. Corbett was deeply regretted by his remaining associates. He brought to the discharge of his duties an experience that rendered him peculiarly well qualified to fill the office, and during the eighteen months that he was with us the depart-



ment benefited distinctly by his services, and by his retirement the city suffered the loss of a capable, experienced and upright official.

Upon the retirement of Mr. Corbett, the Mayor, acting under the provisions of the Revised Ordinances, designated Mr. John H. Donovan of the Assessing Department to temporarily discharge the duties of Election Commissioner. Such duties were faithfully and intelligently performed by Mr. Donovan, who continued as acting Election Commissioner until after the recount which followed the city election, when Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy was appointed Commissioner for the unexpired term.

## EXPENSES.

At the beginning of the year the Board submitted as an estimate of the probable expenditures of the department the sum of \$137,000, and the Board of Estimate and Apportionment allowed therefor the sum of \$127,500. A further sum of \$5,006.62 was received from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in payment of expenses incurred by this department in fitting up the wooden booths for army purposes, and for damages and loss of property, which sum was credited to this department's appropriation; and a balance to the account of Special Loan for new steel voting-booths and furnishings of \$404.27 gave to our appropriation for the year 1899 a total sum of \$132,910.89.

There has actually been expended by this department during the year 1899, chargeable to the regular appropriation the sum of \$126,892.44 and on account of the special loan for new voting-booths the balance from loan of \$404.27, or a total expenditure of \$127,296.71. There remains, therefore, to the credit of this department the sum of \$5,614.18.

The expenditures of the department in detail for the financial year ending January 31, 1900, are as follows:

SALARIES :	
Commissioners . . . . .	\$14,137 67
Assistant Registrars . . . . .	28,741 79
	<hr/>
	\$42,879 46
Election officers . . . . .	21,619 50
Printing . . . . .	20,630 70
Repairs and fitting up precinct polling-places, including sheath- ing of 103 steel booths . . . . .	18,624 34
Copying polls from Assessors' books . . . . .	3,773 99
	<hr/>
<i>Carried forward</i> . . . . .	107,527 99

<i>Brought forward</i> . . .	\$107,527 99	
Care of voting-places . . .	3,510 96	
Rents . . . . .	3,474 05	
Carriage hire and travelling expenses, caucuses and elections . . .	2,674 82	
Furniture and fixtures for booths, and metal rack for vault in office, . . .	2,615 95	
Advertising . . . . .	2,379 06	
Stationery . . . . .	1,437 27	
Posting voting-lists, sample ballots, location of polling-places and carting . . . . .	1,380 54	
Refreshments, employees, police and hackmen, caucuses and elections . . .	684 05	
Repairs of ballot-boxes . . . . .	411 95	
Telephone service . . . . .	377 22	
Fuel, gas and electric light . . . . .	196 85	
Office expenses and small items . . .	92 01	
Typewriting . . . . .	60 42	
Maps . . . . .	35 00	
Constables' services . . . . .	34 30	
		\$126,892 44
<i>Special Loan for New Steel Voting booths and Furnishings.</i>		
Balance unexpended, used towards repairs on booths . . . . .		404 27
		<u>\$127,296 71</u>

The following pages show in tabulated form the number of assessed polls, registered voters and votes cast in this city at the State, municipal and one special election held in 1899. The arrangement of some of the tables has been changed from that of former years and we have profited by the system adopted by the "City Record," which has printed many of the election returns prepared at their request by this department.

The inventory of the property of the department, prepared as required by the Revised Ordinances forms a part of this report, as directed by your printed instructions of February 3, 1900.

Respectfully submitted,

LINUS E. PEARSON,  
TIMOTHY F. McDONOUGH,  
GEORGE P. SANGER,  
PATRICK J. KENNEDY,

*Board of Election Commissioners.*

TABULATED STATEMENT  
OF  
ASSESSED POLLS, REGISTERED VOTERS,  
AND VOTES CAST AT STATE AND  
MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS,

1899.


**Assessed Polls, State Election, 1899.**

[illegible]

# Votes cast for Governor at State Election, 1899.

Wards.	Precinct 1.					Precinct 2.					Precinct 3.					Precinct 4.					Precinct 5.					Precinct 6.					Precinct 7.					Precinct 8.					Precinct 9.					Totals.					For all gubernatorial Candidates.	Wards.			
	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Coats — P.	Crane — R.	Palme — D.	Pearce — S. L.	Porter — D. S. N. P.	Scattering.														
1	5	180	49	4	1	8	249	24	4	...	3	284	59	7	...	9	240	35	1	...	9	191	95	6	1	2	68	190	7	7	4	181	160	5	3	4	133	184	12	1	2	44	1,641	820	33	14	...	2,581	1						
2	5	84	206	16	8	2	76	200	7	3	...	122	237	4	1	3	79	257	11	13	12	60	229	7	4	5	114	203	6	1	2	63	316	11	3	4	90	219	17	22	...	33	688	1,007	79	55	...	2,862	2						
3	3	160	88	4	2	3	96	292	10	4	4	114	182	0	2	4	51	351	7	4	6	51	309	6	4	3	32	242	5	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	23	504	1,584	37	20	...	1,908	3								
4	13	91	175	4	4	4	129	71	3	1	3	12	169	142	3	...	3	92	189	9	2	2	29	235	11	3	1	86	117	5	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	25	506	1,229	34	10	...	1,504	4								
5	2	175	117	6	2	1	119	230	6	2	6	36	261	4	...	1	83	132	4	2	1	82	267	5	2	3	74	144	2	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	14	569	1,151	27	9	...	1,770	5								
6	3	32	242	7	1	10	52	302	9	3	4	76	206	5	11	10	64	217	3	2	3	120	209	17	3	1	146	62	3	1	16	89	228	14	9	3	16	228	1	5	...	62	589	1,753	39	35	...	2,499	6						
7	...	86	120	4	3	4	73	205	3	4	8	108	188	13	3	3	136	66	...	2	1	36	344	10	5	2	36	312	13	2	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	18	469	1,255	43	19	...	1,784	7								
8	7	48	371	10	8	9	100	225	15	5	6	180	74	3	8	5	87	297	18	17	6	100	225	20	27	12	106	327	11	12	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	45	630	1,019	86	77	...	2,457	8								
9	5	98	202	14	16	4	104	232	11	9	3	30	295	11	4	3	109	245	18	7	3	153	112	7	7	3	137	89	5	1	5	66	272	12	4	...	...	...	...	...	...	26	697	1,447	78	48	...	2,296	9						
10	4	78	86	6	5	...	158	88	1	2	4	125	45	7	...	3	151	24	4	3	3	135	22	7	4	3	193	46	4	3	2	298	52	4	...	3	280	77	4	4	1	164	42	...	24	1,582	482	35	20	...	2,143	10			
11	11	194	57	19	2	4	177	95	3	3	6	171	117	3	1	...	169	118	...	1	2	187	34	...	...	...	267	28	1	...	...	230	26	1	4	199	27	...	...	214	27	...	1	29	1,738	529	27	8	4	2,335	11				
12	2	255	69	3	1	3	250	57	3	1	3	151	33	1	3	7	220	111	7	...	10	137	86	...	...	...	168	257	2	6	2	106	211	10	2	...	...	...	...	...	28	1,347	884	32	18	...	2,360	12							
13	1	215	153	4	4	15	252	11	5	2	...	123	194	19	3	...	35	249	7	2	2	41	225	11	5	3	48	169	10	3	1	27	251	13	2	3	26	190	10	3	...	16	232	1,823	96	27	...	2,194	13						
14	4	94	350	9	2	1	34	379	7	4	1	76	193	5	6	...	145	152	8	2	6	178	155	12	2	5	142	140	2	1	5	147	213	12	2	3	133	189	7	3	...	25	949	1,718	62	22	...	2,826	14						
15	4	58	108	9	2	...	29	254	12	3	...	56	199	14	2	4	88	179	5	2	1	101	240	7	...	6	137	118	8	1	2	108	169	13	4	1	103	176	14	1	...	20	680	1,413	82	13	...	2,208	15						
16	5	104	169	16	5	5	89	340	16	3	2	163	263	8	8	8	230	95	9	1	7	188	119	9	...	3	264	36	3	6	5	130	284	16	3	...	...	...	...	...	35	1,188	1,206	77	25	...	2,531	16							
17	2	41	201	7	...	5	54	213	3	2	3	130	119	7	1	1	166	155	4	2	2	54	184	10	6	4	3	211	3	3	6	2	56	238	11	5	2	102	258	10	11	1	137	146	6	3	...	22	775	1,725	61	36	...	2,619	17
18	2	98	280	30	...	1	103	216	22	2	5	136	152	18	4	12	180	238	17	5	3	81	400	17	9	6	125	309	17	7	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	29	702	1,605	121	25	...	2,562	18								
19	3	91	202	23	14	3	76	209	19	2	3	48	343	18	5	5	68	273	17	7	3	95	165	14	...	2	119	202	17	2	4	108	332	8	9	3	94	272	30	13	...	26	699	1,908	146	52	...	2,921	19						
20	7	272	148	8	1	2	255	167	5	1	3	100	135	3	2	3	104	214	6	7	2	226	158	5	...	5	351	125	5	3	3	317	99	6	3	6	306	82	9	1	...	36	2,021	1,128	17	15	...	3,247	20						
21	4	182	108	5	2	5	162	169	2	3	4	99	111	4	2	1	194	162	4	...	3	186	115	5	1	2	230	68	2	3	6	195	178	9	1	2	265	113	2	3	1	236	115	7	2	...	28	1,749	1,079	10	17	...	2,913	21	
22	2	310	197	21	11	...	54	255	7	2	4	243	128	26	5	...	6	207	157	37	9	5	208	51	11	2	8	206	68	3	1	5	165	193	25	6	...	...	...	...	...	38	1,559	1,321	156	47	...	3,121	22						
23	4	181	93	3	...	...	73	274	8	1	5	79	241	19	8	5	135	169	11	2	5	230	168	25	6	5	290	68	20	5	6	215	74	9	...	4	292	56	3	1	5	102	103	5	...	39	1,606	1,276	603	23	...	3,647	23		
24	4	107	158	3	1	...	130	131	10	2	3	233	129	7	...	3	161	108	4	1	2	192	72	6	...	5	182	116	6	...	2	256	96	6	...	5	278	147	17	4	3	185	103	17	1	27	1,724	1,051	76	9	...	2,887	24		
25	5	238	110	2	3	5	270	65	4	5	8	245	47	8	...	6	96	187	11	2	1	136	209	5	3	5	217	142	6	3	6	146	211	1	4	...	...	...	...	...	36	1,348	971	37	20	...	2,412	25							
Grand Totals																																						748	26,372	62,094	1,664	664	4	162,086											

\* Elected by vote of the State. † Proportion of ...  
P., signifies Prohibition; R., Republican; D., ...  
... registered who voted, 61.78 per cent.  
Democratic; S. L., Socialist Labor; D. S. N. P., Democratic Social Nomination Party.



## Registered Voters (Men), State Election, 1899.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Totals.	Per cent. Assessed Polls Registered by wards.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.		
1 .....	352	401	525	463	497	494	593	561	230	4,116	65.50
2 .....	555	415	509	500	427	493	599	630	....	4,123	63.04
3 .....	438	593	483	673	602	487	....	....	....	3,276	73.57
4 .....	474	364	503	492	491	372	....	....	....	2,696	65.45
5 .....	464	539	558	393	588	458	...	....	....	3,000	66.40
6 .....	518	586	617	641	660	320	575	445	....	4,362	45.39
7 .....	333	386	501	365	551	521	....	....	....	2,657	48.31
8 .....	613	565	436	673	710	713	....	....	....	3,710	43.33
9 .....	614	637	538	614	493	387	581	....	....	3,864	44.98
10 .....	374	392	311	369	315	407	609	660	370	3,807	51.31
11 .....	453	479	490	507	373	311	412	366	403	3,794	60.83
12 .....	550	486	403	543	503	699	502	....	....	3,686	52.56
13 .....	523	538	491	525	478	410	503	438	....	3,906	52.37
14 .....	766	651	449	452	561	475	591	537	....	4,482	69.72
15 .....	336	573	484	467	510	451	498	474	....	3,793	68.85
16 .....	456	600	682	593	523	489	698	....	....	4,041	71.98
17 .....	455	455	399	539	422	414	486	632	456	4,258	59.87
18 .....	614	581	621	743	730	723	....	...	....	4,012	53.84
19 .....	547	494	621	558	447	544	721	592	....	4,524	63.27
20 .....	761	759	599	595	850	761	745	729	....	5,799	69.45
21 .....	500	550	356	519	517	506	662	639	599	4,848	72.30
22 .....	826	626	508	605	667	458	517	606	....	4,813	65.58
23 .....	360	488	469	494	674	573	435	483	306	4,282	70.75
24 .....	515	458	669	476	462	461	656	788	536	5,021	69.13
25 .....	570	534	451	460	506	560	535	....	....	3,616	65.15
Total .....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	100,491	

Average per cent. of men assessed who registered 60.23.

**Votes Cast for State Officers (except Governor), State Election,  
1899, in the City of Boston.**

CANDIDATES FOR LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.	VOTES CAST.
*Bates, Republican.....	28,977
Mack, Democratic.....	30,667
Roberts, Prohibition.....	407
Skinner, Democratic Social Nom. Paper.....	784
Stevens, Socialist Labor Party.....	1,573
Scattering.....	4
Total.....	61,812

Proportion of men registered who voted, 61.51 per cent.

CANDIDATES FOR SECRETARY OF STATE.	VOTES CAST.
Bradley, Democratic Social Nom. Paper.....	1,303
Lewis, Prohibition.....	767
Lloyd, Democratic.....	29,470
McDonald, Socialist Labor Party.....	2,408
*Olin, Republican.....	26,007
Total.....	59,955

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.66 per cent.

CANDIDATES FOR TREASURER AND RECEIVER-GENERAL.	VOTES CAST.
*Bradford, Republican.....	26,105
Flynn, Democratic.....	30,538
Griffin, Prohibition.....	525
Nagler, Socialist Labor Party.....	1,839
White, Democratic Social Nom. Paper.....	841
Total.....	59,848

\*Elected.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.56 per cent.



**Votes Cast for State Officers (except Governor), State Election, 1899, in the City of Boston.—Concluded.**

CANDIDATES FOR AUDITOR.	VOTES CAST.
Brown, Democratic.....	29,950
Forsstrom, Socialist Labor Party.....	1,893
*Kimball, Republican.....	25,532
McDonald, Democratic Social Nom. Paper.....	1,452
Palmer, Prohibition.....	480
Scattering.....	1
Total.....	59,308

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.02 per cent.

CANDIDATES FOR ATTORNEY-GENERAL.	VOTES CAST.
Barr, Democratic Social Nom. Paper.....	1,347
*Knowlton, Republican.....	26,690
Morrison, Democratic.....	29,452
Perley, Prohibition.....	456
Skahan, Socialist Labor Party.....	1,852
Total.....	59,797

\*Elected.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.50 per cent.

**Votes Cast for Councillors, State Election, 1899.**

**SECOND DISTRICT.**

Wards.	DAVIS,* Rep.	JOHNSON, Dem.
16.....	1,229	1,183
20.....	2,075	1,127
21.....	1,753	1,097
22.....	1,659	1,325
23.....	1,652	1,331
24.....	1,775	1,058
Totals.....	10,143	7,121

\*Elected.

Registered voters, 28,804.

Votes cast, 17,264.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.94 per cent.

The balance of this district comprises the First Bristol and the First and Second Norfolk Senatorial Districts.

**Votes Cast for Councillors, State Election, 1899.****THIRD DISTRICT.**

<b>Wards.</b>	<b>DURRELL,* Rep.</b>	<b>LUCAS, Dem.</b>
<b>1</b> .....	1,649	838
<b>3</b> .....	525	1,389
<b>4</b> .....	593	979
<b>5</b> .....	584	1,148
<b>Totals</b> .....	3,351	4,354

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 13,088.

Votes cast, 7,705.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 58.87 per cent.

The balance of this district comprises Chelsea, Revere, Winthrop, and the First, Second and Third Middlesex Senatorial Districts.

**FOURTH DISTRICT.**

<b>Wards.</b>	<b>DRESSER, Rep.</b>	<b>QUIRK,* Dem.</b>	<b>Scattering.</b>
<b>2</b> .....	674	1,998	
<b>6</b> .....	618	1,742	
<b>7</b> .....	470	1,168	
<b>8</b> .....	688	1,636	
<b>9</b> .....	735	1,428	
<b>10</b> .....	1,601	478	
<b>11</b> .....	1,763	518	1
<b>12</b> .....	1,378	891	
<b>13</b> .....	301	1,752	
<b>14</b> .....	1,014	1,736	
<b>15</b> .....	785	1,405	
<b>17</b> .....	822	1,789	
<b>18</b> .....	804	1,587	1
<b>19</b> .....	772	2,082	
<b>25</b> .....	1,282	1,031	
<b>Totals</b> .....	13,707	21,241	2

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 58,599.

Votes cast, 34,950.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.64 per cent.

## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## FIRST SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 1.	CRAMB, Dem. Social Nom. Paper.	EFFORD, Socialist Labor.	LANE, Dem.	WITT,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....	4	5	50	174
" 2.....	1	8	19	249
" 3.....	..	7	52	293
" 4.....	1	2	30	246
" 5.....	2	3	80	194
" 6.....	7	6	170	91
" 7.....	6	10	131	212
" 8.....	3	13	159	164
" 9.....	3	9	25	110
Totals.....	27	63	716	1,733

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 4,116.

Votes cast, 2,539.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 61.69 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Chelsea, Revere and Winthrop.

# Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## SECOND SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 3.	BRYANT, Rep.	TAGUE,* Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	157	98	
" 2.....	91	245	
" 3.....	106	193	1
" 4.....	47	349	
" 5.....	49	327	
" 6.....	35	253	
Totals .....	485	1,465	1
Ward 4.			
Precinct 1.....	67	212	
" 2.....	126	81	
" 3.....	164	147	
" 4.....	92	205	
" 5.....	29	249	
" 6.....	94	123	
Totals .....	572	1,017	
Ward 5.			
Precinct 1.....	169	126	
" 2.....	115	246	
" 3.....	36	273	
" 4.....	87	135	
" 5.....	68	287	
" 6.....	75	178	
Totals .....	550	1,245	
Grand totals .....	1,607	3,727	1

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 8,972.

Votes cast, 5,335.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.46 per cent.

The balance of this district is composed of Ward 3 of Cambridge.

## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## THIRD SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 2.	AULD, Rep.	MAHONEY,* Dem.	O'ROURKE, Dem. Cit. Nom. paper.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	92	246	35	
" 2.....	79	179	16	
" 3.....	108	222	20	
" 4.....	70	238	22	
" 5.....	63	199	19	
" 6.....	118	187	14	
" 7.....	52	315	21	
" 8.....	92	302	25	
Totals.....	674	1,888	172	
<b>Ward 6.</b>				
Precinct 1.....	32	202	46	
" 2.....	46	277	42	
" 3.....	66	232	56	
" 4.....	38	247	32	
" 5.....	104	216	42	
" 6.....	138	60	5	1
" 7.....	64	235	43	
" 8.....	22	214	21	
Totals.....	510	1,683	287	1
<b>Ward 8.</b>				
Precinct 1.....	54	334	28	2
" 2.....	110	205	20	
" 3.....	191	57	11	
" 4.....	119	234	24	1
" 5.....	115	275	47	1
" 6.....	116	301	19	2
Totals.....	705	1,406	149	6
Grand totals. ...	1,889	4,977	608	7

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 12,200.

Votes cast, 7,481.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 61.32 per cent.

## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## FOURTH SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 7.	IRVING, Rep.	KELIHER,* Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1 .....	97	101	
" 2 .....	81	151	
" 3 .....	108	186	
" 4 .....	114	76	
" 5 .....	35	322	
" 6 .....	51	273	
Totals .....	486	1,109	
Ward 9.			
Precinct 1 .....	95	232	
" 2 .....	94	247	
" 3 .....	28	307	1
" 4 .....	112	246	
" 5 .....	155	117	
" 6 .....	140	86	
" 7 .....	82	270	
Totals .....	706	1,505	1
Ward 17.			
Precinct 1 .....	38	210	
" 2 .....	60	214	
" 3 .....	140	110	
" 4 .....	165	160	1
" 5 .....	64	193	
" 6 .....	40	206	
" 7 .....	61	247	
" 8 .....	127	253	
" 9 .....	149	136	
Totals .....	844	1,729	1
Grand totals .....	2,036	4,343	2

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 10,779.

Votes cast, 6,381.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.20 per cent.

## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## FIFTH SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 10.		BARNES, Cit.	CURLEY, Dem.	INNES,* Rep.
Precinct 1	.....	15	120	61
" 2	.....	14	96	141
" 3	.....	14	46	117
" 4	.....	11	34	130
" 5	.....	2	41	123
" 6	.....	18	62	161
" 7	.....	19	48	282
" 8	.....	20	82	264
" 9	.....	2	40	161
Totals		115	569	1,440
Ward 12.				
Precinct 1	.....	17	63	244
" 2	.....	20	53	233
" 3	.....	10	99	141
" 4	.....	27	101	210
" 5	.....	15	95	177
" 6	.....	16	258	157
" 7	.....	13	237	87
Totals		118	906	1,249
Ward 18.				
Precinct 1	.....	13	318	72
" 2	.....	14	239	86
" 3	.....	10	200	148
" 4	.....	27	288	146
" 5	.....	23	415	61
" 6	.....	15	318	108
Totals		102	1,778	621
Grand totals		335	3,253	3,310

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 11,505.

Votes cast, 6,898.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 59.96 per cent.

## -Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## SIXTH SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 13.		BALDWIN,* Dem.	DRYDEN, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	.....	242	31	
" 2	.....	227	39	
" 3	.....	229	31	
" 4	.....	232	46	
" 5	.....	200	57	
" 6	.....	167	53	
" 7	.....	222	48	
" 8	.....	175	49	
Totals		1,694	354	
Ward 14.				
Precinct 1	.....	380	95	
" 2	.....	369	57	1
" 3	.....	181	95	
" 4	.....	121	167	
" 5	.....	141	200	
" 6	.....	125	152	
" 7	.....	212	153	
" 8	.....	167	150	
Totals		1,696	1,069	1
Ward 15.				
Precinct 1	.....	115	64	
" 2	.....	238	53	
" 3	.....	175	82	
" 4	.....	162	100	
" 5	.....	184	119	
" 6	.....	111	155	
" 7	.....	147	132	
" 8	.....	141	140	
Totals		1,273	845	
Grand totals		4,663	2,268	1

\*Elected.

Registered voters, 12,181.

Votes cast, 6,932.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 56.91 per cent.



## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## SEVENTH SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 16.		HENNESSEY, Dem.	LOTT,* Rep.
Precinct 1	.....	161	115
" 2	.....	228	101
" 3	.....	247	180
" 4	.....	86	260
" 5	.....	117	203
" 6	.....	29	272
" 7	.....	276	153
Totals.....		1,144	1,284
Ward 20.			
Precinct 1	.....	145	276
" 2	.....	158	266
" 3	.....	139	193
" 4	.....	224	114
" 5	.....	164	236
" 6	.....	115	362
" 7	.....	98	323
" 8	.....	71	323
Totals.....		1,114	2,093
Ward 24.			
Precinct 1	.....	169	112
" 2	.....	135	141
" 3	.....	107	245
" 4	.....	111	166
" 5	.....	71	193
" 6	.....	121	183
" 7	.....	84	270
" 8	.....	147	295
" 9	.....	105	188
Totals.....		1,050	1,793
Grand totals.....		3,308	5,170

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 14,861.

Votes cast, 8,478.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 57.05 per cent.

## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## EIGHTH SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 21.		MAXWELL,* Rep.	SEAUER, Dem.
Precinct 1	.....	173	117
" 2	.....	158	174
" 3	.....	98	106
" 4	.....	190	108
" 5	.....	176	129
" 6	.....	223	80
" 7	.....	192	194
" 8	.....	257	110
" 9	.....	224	132
Totals		1,691	1,150
Ward 22.			
Precinct 1	.....	315	214
" 2	.....	122	264
" 3	.....	56	256
" 4	.....	263	117
" 5	.....	220	169
" 6	.....	230	53
" 7	.....	279	70
" 8	.....	190	200
Totals		1,675	1,343
Ward 23.			
Precinct 1	.....	178	96
" 2	.....	68	292
" 3	.....	95	240
" 4	.....	133	205
" 5	.....	247	181
" 6	.....	301	73
" 7	.....	223	75
" 8	.....	291	62
" 9	.....	101	111
Totals		1,637	1,335
Grand totals		5,003	3,828

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 13,943.

Votes cast, 8,831.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 63.34 per cent.

## Votes Cast for Senator, State Election, 1899.

## NINTH SUFFOLK DISTRICT.

Ward 11.		DEMPSEY, Dem.	Ross,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	.....	67	201	1
" 2	.....	93	176	
" 3	.....	123	180	
" 4	.....	105	203	
" 5	.....	26	197	
" 6	.....	22	175	
" 7	.....	30	222	
" 8	.....	21	204	
" 9	.....	26	216	
Totals.....		513	1,774	1
Ward 19.				
Precinct 1	.....	225	102	
" 2	.....	218	93	
" 3	.....	356	60	
" 4	.....	293	74	
" 5	.....	170	95	
" 6	.....	215	120	
" 7	.....	343	125	
" 8	.....	316	106	
Totals.....		2,136	775	
Ward 25.				
Precinct 1	.....	109	251	
" 2	.....	63	270	
" 3	.....	50	237	
" 4	.....	177	128	
" 5	.....	175	186	
" 6	.....	132	243	
" 7	.....	208	176	
Totals.....		914	1,491	
Grand totals.....		3,563	4,040	1

\*Elected.

Registered voters, 11,934.

Votes cast, 7,604.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 63.72 per cent.

# Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## FIRST DISTRICT.

Ward 1.		A. DUDLEY BAGLEY, Rep. *	THOMAS A. NILAND, Dem.	PATRICK O'CONNOR, Dem.	HUGH L. STALKER, Rep. *
Precinct 1	177	46	40	169	
" 2	237	22	19	233	
" 3	276	48	46	266	
" 4	241	34	29	232	
" 5	200	85	79	184	
" 6	90	170	163	80	
" 7	211	139	127	191	
" 8	190	174	108	123	
" 9	106	30	24	98	
Totals	1,728	748	635	1,581	

\* Elected.

## SECOND DISTRICT.

Ward 2.		JOSEPH J. DENNISON, Rep.	JAMES H. DONOVAN, Dem. *	JOHN J. DOUGLASS, Dem. Citizens' Nom. Paper.	JOSEPH F. HICKEY, Dem.	WILLIAM J. POWERS, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	BENNIE M. SCHWARTZ, Rep.
Precinct 1	43	164	286	134	22	35	
" 2	43	129	174	121	12	24	
" 3	80	183	188	162	4	40	
" 4	44	174	223	155	19	25	
" 5	36	139	161	172	10	33	
" 6	70	138	176	170	9	42	
" 7	24	230	244	257	6	17	
" 8	54	249	227	199	24	58	
Totals	394	1,406	1,679	1,370	106	274	

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## THIRD DISTRICT.

Ward 3.	DEUTY JEREAULD, Rep.	JEREMIAH F. MCCARTHY,* Dem.	CHARLES H. PAINE, Rep.	CHARLES S. SULLIVAN,* Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	146	108	147	79	1
" 2.....	64	263	60	233	
" 3.....	74	209	80	184	
" 4.....	26	343	30	313	
" 5.....	40	308	43	283	
" 6.....	19	254	33	234	
Totals .....	369	1,485	369	1,485	1

\* Elected.

## FOURTH DISTRICT.

Ward 4.	GEORGE A. GARLAND, Rep.	THOMAS H. GREEN,* Dem.	GEORGE H. HAYDEN, Rep.	WILLIAM E. MAHONEY,* Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	74	201	66	198	
" 2.....	138	67	126	68	
" 3.....	161	129	152	124	
" 4.....	89	210	75	196	
" 5.....	33	234	19	257	
" 6.....	94	106	82	113	
Totals .....	589	947	520	956	

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.**

**FIFTH DISTRICT.**

<b>Ward 5.</b>	<b>EDWARD A. CARTER, Rep.</b>	<b>ARTHUR HARRINGTON,* Dem.</b>	<b>MARTIN P. HIGGINS,* Dem.</b>	<b>ALFRED S. HOLMAN, Rep.</b>	<b>Scattering.</b>
Precinct <b>1</b> .....	159	128	115	142	
“ <b>2</b> .....	102	251	243	87	
“ <b>3</b> .....	39	266	271	31	
“ <b>4</b> .....	83	135	140	73	
“ <b>5</b> .....	78	255	273	66	1
“ <b>6</b> .....	64	188	188	58	
<b>Totals</b> .....	525	1,223	1,230	457	1

\* Elected.

**SIXTH DISTRICT.**

<b>Ward 6.</b>	<b>CYRUS K. BABB, Rep.</b>	<b>SAMUEL H. BOROFKY,* Dem.</b>	<b>MICHAEL J. DONOVAN,* Dem.</b>	<b>DANIEL J. KANE, Dem. Cit. Nom. Paper, Rep.</b>
Precinct <b>1</b> .....	20	140	160	182
“ <b>2</b> .....	26	236	256	163
“ <b>3</b> .....	39	207	234	170
“ <b>4</b> .....	29	171	228	150
“ <b>5</b> .....	71	234	212	153
“ <b>6</b> .....	138	59	60	111
“ <b>7</b> .....	45	252	228	145
“ <b>8</b> .....	12	166	190	110
<b>Totals</b> .....	380	1,465	1,568	1,184

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## SEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 7.	WILLIAM A. H. CROWLEY, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.	JOHN L. DONOVAN,* Dem.	DAVID O. FELT, Rep.	WILLIAM T. A. FITZGERALD,* Dem.	RICHARD MIDDLETON, Rep.	JAMES ROBERTSON, Rep. Ind. Nom. Paper.
Precinct 1.....	33	81	90	78	68	13
" 2.....	59	222	116	110	43	15
" 3.....	104	93	138	112	58	20
" 4.....	47	42	123	57	79	14
" 5.....	206	170	41	240	10	7
" 6.....	125	219	40	153	19	4
Totals.....	574	827	548	750	277	73

\* Elected.

## EIGHTH DISTRICT.

Ward 8.	EDWARD J. DONOVAN,* Dem.	WALLACE F. FLANDERS, Rep.	FRANCIS J. HORGAN,* Dem.	BENJAMIN RAMIN, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	JACOB TARPLIN, Rep.
Precinct 1.....	335	57	348	33	43
" 2.....	214	102	219	21	87
" 3.....	64	183	58	41	121
" 4.....	273	87	281	28	83
" 5.....	300	88	310	54	92
" 6.....	313	99	312	24	88
Totals.....	1,499	616	1,528	201	514

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## NINTH DISTRICT.

Ward 9.		JOHN J. GART- LAND, JR.,* Dem.	RICHARD J. HAYES,* Dem.	MOSES J. KONI- KOW, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	JAMES F. MORGAN, Rep.	JULIUS J. SCHRIFTGIESSER, Rep.
Precinct	1.....	219	192	33	85	78
"	2.....	233	215	23	89	80
"	3.....	316	263	21	20	13
"	4.....	266	251	13	91	82
"	5.....	100	97	8	151	133
"	6.....	82	86	5	135	119
"	7.....	259	256	12	73	58
Totals .....		1,475	1,360	115	644	563

\* Elected.

## TENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 10.		FREEMAN O. EMERSON,* Rep.	WILLIAM COL- VARD PAR- KER,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct	1.....	110	111	1
"	2.....	171	165	
"	3.....	145	140	
"	4.....	166	138	
"	5.....	140	120	
"	6.....	203	194	
"	7.....	307	288	
"	8.....	306	298	
"	9.....	172	167	
Totals .....		1,720	1,621	1

\* Elected.



## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## ELEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 11.		ROBERT SEVER HALE, Dem.	CHARLES R. SAUNDERS,* Rep.	GEORGE S. SELFIDGE,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	.....	78	212	174	1
" 2	.....	98	182	156	
" 3	.....	130	200	142	
" 4	.....	151	209	168	
" 5	.....	60	185	168	
" 6	.....	35	167	160	
" 7	.....	47	221	210	
" 8	.....	38	192	184	
" 9	.....	44	200	197	
Totals		681	1,768	1,559	1

\* Elected.

## TWELFTH DISTRICT.

Ward 12.		JAMES F. BLISS,* Rep.	DAVID B. CHAMBER- LAIN, Rep. Ind. Nom. Paper.	JOHN H. COLBY,* Rep.	JOHN J. CURELEY, Dem.	HUGH J. QUINN, Dem.	WILLIAM WIXTED, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.
Precinct 1	.....	229	102	180	38	37	7
" 2	.....	224	106	174	41	32	4
" 3	.....	115	114	71	81	92	2
" 4	.....	197	121	138	82	81	5
" 5	.....	177	99	129	79	58	14
" 6	.....	135	71	123	260	206	13
" 7	.....	76	44	127	183	224	7
Totals		1,153	657	942	764	730	52

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## THIRTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 13.		HENRY E. GOULD- ING, Rep.	MICHAEL J. LYDON,* Dem.	FREDERICK C. MAHONY,* Dem.	ERNEST P. SEARLES, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	13	239	243	14		
" 2	23	241	216	19		
" 3	16	245	228	12		
" 4	35	244	232	28		1
" 5	30	216	213	27		1
" 6	45	169	175	43		
" 7	24	248	247	20		
" 8	21	189	194	21		
Totals	207	1,791	1,748	184		2

\* Elected.

## FOURTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 14.	MINER H. A. EVANS, Rep.	DAVID J. GLEA- SON,* Dem.	ROBERT E. HAR- RISON, Rep.	MICHAEL J. SUL- LIVAN,* Dem.
Precinct 1.....	90	368	88	313
“ 2.....	32	378	53	329
“ 3.....	65	188	70	180
“ 4.....	137	137	148	126
“ 5.....	167	148	167	155
“ 6.....	137	125	141	120
“ 7.....	125	220	139	225
“ 8.....	131	167	135	162
Totals .....	884	1,731	941	1,610

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## FIFTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 15.		THOMAS F. BRADFORD, Rep.	DANIEL V. McISAAC,* Dem.	WILLIAM S. McNARY,* Dem.	THOMAS E. MORAN, Rep.
Precinct 1.....		39	135	118	43
" 2.....		44	262	237	40
" 3.....		58	205	185	54
" 4.....		84	183	171	68
" 5.....		95	216	202	78
" 6.....		128	126	137	113
" 7.....		96	165	176	85
" 8.....		96	189	184	90
Totals.....		640	1,481	1,410	571

\* Elected.

## SIXTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 16.		WILLIAM J. DONOVAN, Dem.	LAWRENCE J. EARLE, Dem.	FREDERICK W. FAR- WELL,* Rep.	ARTHUR P. RUSSELL,* Rep.
Precinct 1.....		193	137	136	75
" 2.....		230	203	136	73
" 3.....		222	181	206	162
" 4.....		90	81	247	249
" 5.....		108	101	192	211
" 6.....		33	36	249	248
" 7.....		252	257	139	187
Totals.....		1,128	996	1,305	1,205

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## SEVENTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 17.		CHARLES W. BLANCH- ARD, Rep.	CHARLES J. KIDNEY, Rep.	JOHN P. LANERGAN,* Dem.	JOHN J. MANSFIELD,* Dem.
Precinct 1	.....	31	49	201	158
" 2	.....	46	75	198	178
" 3	.....	128	138	106	114
" 4	.....	152	168	134	158
" 5	.....	45	83	173	183
" 6	.....	32	61	192	173
" 7	.....	43	114	196	216
" 8	.....	102	178	235	216
" 9	.....	137	175	106	127
Totals	.....	716	1,041	1,541	1,523

\* Elected.

## EIGHTEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 18.		CHARLES H. BRYANT, Rep.	MICHAEL E. GADDIS,* Dem.	EDWARD F. TRACY, Rep.	JAMES A. WATSON,* Dem.
Precinct 1	.....	178	207	72	196
" 2	.....	131	167	94	202
" 3	.....	204	121	162	141
" 4	.....	218	196	166	202
" 5	.....	101	358	44	250
" 6	.....	148	250	106	254
Totals	.....	980	1,299	644	1,245

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## NINETEENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 19.		WILLIAM L. MOONEY,* Dem.	BELLEVILLE L. RANDALL, Rep.	JOHN E. THOMSON,* Dem.	NEIL J. WALLACE, Rep.
Precinct 1	.....	210	88	203	89
" 2	.....	214	75	213	77
" 3	.....	366	37	300	56
" 4	.....	285	52	267	59
" 5	.....	151	92	168	77
" 6	.....	202	114	201	120
" 7	.....	346	94	300	113
" 8	.....	299	82	266	99
Totals	.....	2,073	634	1,918	690

\* Elected.

## TWENTIETH DISTRICT.

Ward 20.		JAMES J. BYRNE, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	WILLIAM L. CAHAN- LAN, Dem.	DANIEL J. DALY, Dem.	FRANK A. FOSTER,* Rep.	JAMES HOWELL,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	.....	9	131	154	248	257	
" 2	.....	18	133	159	246	253	2
" 3	.....	10	122	124	188	181	
" 4	.....	26	188	190	106	103	1
" 5	.....	10	148	138	240	226	
" 6	.....	14	107	114	324	342	
" 7	.....	8	93	80	312	309	
" 8	.....	7	68	61	298	314	
Totals	.....	102	990	1,020	1,962	1,985	3

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## TWENTY-FIRST DISTRICT.

Ward 21.	JEREMIAH BROSNAN, Dem.	MELANCTHON W. BURLIN,* Rep.	MARTIN P. F. CURLEY, Dem.	TEMPLE A. WINSLOE,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	90	136	147	147	1
" 2.....	146	133	210	146	
" 3.....	95	92	115	83	
" 4.....	91	159	137	158	
" 5.....	111	150	128	159	
" 6.....	67	195	72	198	
" 7.....	153	167	191	177	
" 8.....	109	223	128	225	
" 9.....	141	180	128	179	
Totals.....	1,003	1,435	1,256	1,472	1

\* Elected.

## TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT.

Ward 22.	JOHN BLEILER, Rep.	CHARLES O. ENGSTROM,* Rep.	WILLIAM F. PRINDEVILLE, Dem.	JOHN YOUNG, JR., Dem.
Precinct 1.....	312	322	151	189
" 2.....	155	93	214	319
" 3.....	74	64	235	254
" 4.....	224	255	118	128
" 5.....	203	187	130	203
" 6.....	205	226	55	59
" 7.....	240	257	73	64
" 8.....	159	203	220	184
Totals.....	1,572	1,607	1,196	1,400

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.

## TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT.

Ward 23.	ROSWELL S. BARROWS, Rep.	ANDREW BRAUER, Rep.	THOMAS F. I. CURLEY, * Dem.	JOHN M. MINTON, * Dem.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	165	135	104	129	
" 2.....	63	55	311	294	
" 3.....	76	51	293	260	
" 4.....	94	88	250	273	
" 5.....	196	235	199	222	
" 6.....	213	267	79	144	1
" 7.....	178	178	86	137	
" 8.....	273	230	57	130	
" 9.....	88	96	114	143	
Totals.....	1,346	1,335	1,493	1,732	1

\* Elected.

## TWENTY-FOURTH DISTRICT.

Ward 24.	MICHAEL J. BARRY, Dem.	MANUS J. FISH, Dem.	FRED C. GIL- PATRICK, * Rep.	HARRY B. WHALL, * Rep.
Precinct 1.....	168	150	104	95
" 2.....	129	123	126	128
" 3.....	115	105	226	230
" 4.....	111	108	151	163
" 5.....	70	67	191	169
" 6.....	126	117	170	156
" 7.....	88	84	258	253
" 8.....	147	139	273	262
" 9.....	99	97	173	182
Totals.....	1,053	990	1,672	1,638

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Representatives, State Election, 1899.**

**TWENTY-FIFTH DISTRICT.**

<b>Ward 25.</b>		<b>AUSTIN BIGELOW, * Rep.</b>	<b>FRANK H. RICKER, Dem.</b>	<b>WILLIAM D. WHEELER,* Rep.</b>
Precinct <b>1</b> .....		252	114	251
“ <b>2</b> .....		263	73	278
“ <b>3</b> .....		238	60	242
“ <b>4</b> .....		136	197	106
“ <b>5</b> .....		201	213	147
“ <b>6</b> .....		259	189	181
“ <b>7</b> .....		202	249	128
<b>Totals</b> .....		1,551	1,095	1,333

\* Elected.



## Number of Men Registered who Voted

(AS PER WARD OFFICERS' RETURNS OF NAMES CHECKED ON VOTING LISTS) AT STATE ELECTION, 1899.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Number of names checked.	Number registered.	Per cent. registered who voted.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.			
1 ...	241	291	360	294	308	305	384	351	157	2,691	4,116	65.38
2 ...	457	318	390	410	341	372	485	508	....	3,281	4,128	79.48
3 ...	269	370	321	427	400	321	....	....	....	2,108	3,276	64.35
4 ...	300	219	322	316	318	234	....	....	....	1,709	2,696	63.39
5 ...	310	381	341	232	379	273	....	....	....	1,916	3,000	63.87
6 ...	337	432	415	371	425	220	430	304	....	2,934	4,362	67.26
7 ...	216	366	336	225	426	392	....	....	....	1,961	2,657	73.81
8 ...	475	374	277	448	520	491	....	....	....	2,585	3,710	69.68
9 ...	354	374	379	395	291	242	384	....	....	2,419	3,864	62.60
10 ...	213	265	186	195	170	253	362	377	211	2,232	3,807	58.63
11 ...	290	295	318	331	231	206	263	236	246	2,416	3,794	63.68
12 ...	342	324	277	347	317	466	354	....	....	2,427	3,686	65.84
13 ...	317	314	296	314	290	254	316	242	....	2,343	3,906	59.98
14 ...	502	475	291	313	359	297	402	346	....	2,985	4,482	66.60
15 ...	194	321	284	286	329	284	304	309	....	2,311	3,793	60.93
16 ...	317	375	457	374	333	314	472	....	....	2,642	4,041	65.38
17 ...	277	298	266	337	276	276	331	415	301	2,777	4,258	65.22
18 ...	431	375	400	493	545	485	....	....	....	2,729	4,012	68.02
19 ...	356	333	444	393	289	359	485	457	....	3,116	4,524	68.88
20 ...	441	447	347	360	408	495	436	411	....	3,345	5,799	57.68
21 ...	312	363	222	308	322	307	400	391	368	2,993	4,848	61.74
22 ...	558	457	348	428	448	293	361	447	....	3,340	4,813	69.40
23 ...	285	395	383	376	471	398	313	364	230	3,215	4,282	75.08
24 ...	301	284	376	286	280	317	366	460	315	2,985	5,021	59.45
25 ...	374	358	316	327	373	391	410	....	....	2,549	3,616	70.49
Totals.....										66,009	100,491	

Proportion of men registered who voted, 65.69 per cent.

**Votes Cast for Representative, Special Election, February 7,  
1899.**

THIRTEENTH DISTRICT.	FREDERICK C. MA- HONY, * DEM.	Scattering.
<b>Ward 13</b> .....	557	5

\* Elected.

Registered voters, 3,986.

Votes cast, 562.

Proportion of men registered who voted, 14.10 per cent.


MUNICIPAL ELECTION,

**1899.**



Votes Cast for

Wards.	Precinct 1.			Precinct 2.			Precinct 3.			Precinct 4.			Total
	John H. Duane.	Edward A. Mason.	Edward W. Presbo.	John H. Duane.	Edward A. Mason.	Edward W. Presbo.	John H. Duane.	Edward A. Mason.	Edward W. Presbo.	John H. Duane.	Edward A. Mason.	Edward W. Presbo.	
1 . . . .	82	6 202		67	7 263		114	8 314		84	8 299		
2 . . . .	271	18 152		197	14 109		246	6 166		266	13 122		
3 . . . .	84	9 274		241	19 219		166	8 227		324	8 198		
4 . . . .	184	9 194		75	7 203		150	7 255		187	8 187		
5 . . . .	104	6 257		220	8 217		212	8 187		117	10 176		
6 . . . .	217	4 94		314	11 104		256	10 149		244	6 103		
7 . . . .	125	7 126		232	13 93		196	14 146		73	10 152		
8 . . . .	375	23 105		221	28 170		99	10 246		340	33 164		
9 . . . .	269	37 142		284	22 147		367	23 47		267	27 162		
10 . . . .	131	11 108		88	7 197		55	7 179		42	11 199		
11 . . . .	98	8 244		121	11 206		155	8 211		169	6 242		
12 . . . .	86	5 296		85	11 284		149	5 171		133	15 270		
13 . . . .	280	15 86		286	15 74		262	11 78		306	13 79		
14 . . . .	403	17 163		408	25 84		208	18 137		159	11 204		
15 . . . .	123	12 99		272	16 105		230	14 124		192	14 153		
16 . . . .	179	23 153		268	14 160		283	22 233		136	18 330		
17 . . . .	231	6 101		232	15 97		151	8 196		179	7 272		
18 . . . .	295	18 158		265	32 138		168	24 276		255	31 254		
19 . . . .	264	20 126		245	26 119		389	24 90		318	24 122		
20 . . . .	206	25 374		265	14 350		229	4 247		308	15 157		
21 . . . .	125	19 262		200	7 247		124	11 166		125	10 293		
22 . . . .	257	32 381		297	39 153		280	19 98		149	28 317		
23 . . . .	117	3 195		292	6 131		276	18 107		222	9 215		
24 . . . .	221	16 180		172	16 220		194	12 342		175	18 226		
25 . . . .	155	11 302		90	17 342		77	7 287		220	19 148		
Grand Totals . . . . .													



## Registered Voters (Men), Municipal Election, 1899.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Totals.	Per cent. as- sessed polls, registered by wards.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.		
1.....	359	405	531	472	507	503	608	571	234	4,190	66.68
2.....	562	424	516	506	432	499	607	643	....	4,189	63.97
3.....	456	600	495	691	609	494	....	....	....	3,345	75.12
4.....	482	375	517	499	497	389	....	....	....	2,759	66.98
5.....	467	547	570	402	597	462	....	....	....	3,045	67.40
6.....	524	591	628	644	675	329	585	451	....	4,427	46.07
7.....	341	398	515	375	568	533	....	....	....	2,730	49.64
8.....	628	573	464	701	731	735	....	....	....	3,832	44.76
9.....	632	649	558	628	508	396	588	....	....	3,959	46.08
10.....	380	401	319	379	317	411	624	671	379	3,881	52.31
11.....	463	491	503	521	379	324	416	370	424	3,891	62.39
12.....	568	492	426	562	521	731	528	....	....	3,828	54.58
13.....	543	545	511	543	493	426	515	451	....	4,027	53.99
14.....	773	659	455	460	573	492	607	565	....	4,584	71.30
15.....	337	578	492	474	516	457	502	481	....	3,837	69.65
16.....	458	607	687	609	531	494	711	....	....	4,097	72.98
17.....	475	463	412	572	432	419	498	648	462	4,381	61.60
18.....	632	620	642	761	748	736	....	....	....	4,139	55.54
19.....	559	518	643	579	455	560	752	610	....	4,676	65.40
20.....	775	776	614	610	863	776	753	748	....	5,915	70.84
21.....	514	560	361	526	534	523	679	654	608	4,959	73.96
22.....	839	629	514	615	678	468	526	618	....	4,887	66.59
23.....	365	497	476	517	678	580	439	487	308	4,347	71.83
24.....	543	480	692	499	476	471	684	831	568	5,244	72.63
25.....	581	558	459	476	512	575	545	....	....	3,706	66.77
Total.....										102,875	

Average per cent. of men assessed who registered, 61.66.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## FIRST DISTRICT.

Ward 1.		JAMES A. COCHRAN, Rep.	FREDERICK W. DAY,* Dem.	JOHN A. GRADY, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	JAMES H. JENNESS, Soc. Labor.	HORACE SIAS, Dem. Cit. Nom. Paper.
Precinct 1	.....	156	128	3	1	5
" 2	.....	240	88	1	6	4
" 3	.....	260	162	4	4	3
" 4	.....	275	107	.....	1	11
" 5	.....	224	164	6	2	9
" 6	.....	101	282	6	4	5
" 7	.....	242	239	7	3	9
" 8	.....	145	277	2	9	31
" 9	.....	94	81	.. .. .	5	1
Totals	.....	1,737	1,528	29	35	78
Ward 2.						
Precinct 1	.....	110	294	15	8	6
" 2	.....	79	220	14	3	5
" 3	.....	133	273	4	1	3
" 4	.....	95	297	8	6	4
" 5	.....	78	243	4	7	3
" 6	.....	128	237	2	5	1
" 7	.....	87	362	7	3	5
" 8	.....	116	348	23	8	12
Totals	.....	826	2,274	77	41	39
Grand totals	.....	2,563	3,802	106	76	117

\* Elected.



## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## SECOND DISTRICT.

Ward 3.		WILLIAM H. OAKES, Rep.	DANIEL F. O'BRIEN, Dem. Cit. Nom. Paper.	PHILIP O'BRIEN,* Dem.
Precinct 1	.....	256	22	94
" 2	.....	142	25	308
" 3	.....	164	20	215
" 4	.....	81	51	391
" 5	.....	110	44	320
" 6	.....	62	37	286
Totals.....		815	199	1,614
Ward 4.				
Precinct 1	.....	110	27	245
" 2	.....	187	9	91
" 3	.....	213	20	180
" 4	.....	123	12	251
" 5	.....	67	20	285
" 6	.....	128	15	163
Totals.....		828	103	1,215
Ward 5.				
Precinct 1	.....	246	10	110
" 2	.....	159	25	260
" 3	.....	57	35	302
" 4	.....	116	18	162
" 5	.....	124	29	294
" 6	.....	119	16	201
Totals .....		821	133	1,329
Grand totals .....		2,464	435	4,158

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## THIRD DISTRICT.

Ward 6.		EDWARD W. DIXON,* Dem.	MORRIS KAPLAN, Soc. Labor.	JOSEPH SPEKTORSKY, Rep.
Precinct 1	.....	309	9	24
" 2	.....	350	17	37
" 3	.....	338	22	33
" 4	.....	320	11	13
" 5	.....	317	27	89
" 6	.....	93	13	138
" 7	.....	300	30	76
" 8	.....	298	8	14
Totals	.....	2,325	137	424
Ward 8.				
Precinct 1	.....	398	45	71
" 2	.....	281	34	91
" 3	.....	132	15	184
" 4	.....	373	44	106
" 5	.....	363	73	110
" 6	.....	408	48	109
Totals	.....	1,955	259	671
Grand totals	.....	4,280	396	1,095

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1899.

## FOURTH DISTRICT.

Ward 7.		DALE ARMSTRONG, Rep. Mc.K. Nom. Paper.	DAVID F. BARRY, Dem. Lab. Nom. Paper, R.	WILLIAM E. BARRY, Dem. Citizens' Nom. Paper.	PATRICK BOWEN,* Dem.	HUGH W. BRESNAHAN, Dem. Lab. Nom. Paper.	EDWARD CARR, Soc. Lab.	CORNELIUS CURRIE, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	WILLIAM R. DYER, Soc. Lab.	EDWIN A. LEONARD, Rep.	MICHAEL W. NORRIS,* Dem.
Precinct 1....	47	93	6	87	51	9	3	6	93	96	
" 2....	33	159	11	104	154	10	7	9	69	110	
" 3....	39	115	15	145	107	15	8	14	85	134	
" 4....	45	94	9	68	43	7	3	7	105	61	
" 5....	7	97	15	252	165	12	4	7	20	208	
" 6....	23	86	40	183	210	5	4	16	44	138	
Totals .....	194	644	96	839	730	58	29	59	416	747	
Ward 9.											
Precinct 1....	52	102	9	251	38	21	15	20	88	222	
" 2....	46	105	9	309	53	19	7	14	82	267	
" 3....	3	43	16	367	88	13	10	10	13	288	
" 4....	54	114	15	278	81	20	9	19	92	191	
" 5....	79	176	5	134	45	28	9	13	144	97	
" 6....	91	96	12	88	22	10	1	13	160	64	
" 7....	32	82	16	342	96	9	4	4	60	225	
Totals.....	357	718	82	1,769	423	120	55	93	639	1,354	
Ward 13.											
Precinct 1....	3	60	13	195	166	6	2	6	11	253	
" 2....	1	48	18	195	148	6	3	8	9	277	
" 3....	2	32	6	192	136	2	1	3	8	270	
" 4....	11	45	5	197	170	5	2	7	19	268	
" 5....	13	57	8	161	178	11	3	12	24	223	
" 6....	14	58	7	121	150	9	2	7	40	172	
" 7....	6	53	7	143	243	13	.....	11	12	215	
" 8....	8	47	15	112	204	11	6	6	19	171	
Totals .....	58	400	79	1,316	1,395	63	19	60	142	1,849	
Grand totals.	609	1,762	257	3,924	2,548	241	103	212	1,197	3,950	

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## FIFTH DISTRICT.

Ward 10.	HENRY C. HESS, Soc. Labor.	GEORGE H. MOORE, Rep.	* MICHAEL J. O'BRIEN, Dem.
Precinct 1 .....	15	109	139
“ 2 .....	5	191	109
“ 3 .....	9	178	59
“ 4 .....	10	201	36
“ 5 .....	7	164	33
“ 6 .....	7	245	44
“ 7 .....	9	380	52
“ 8 .....	13	368	101
“ 9 .....	2	226	52
Totals .....	77	2,062	625
Ward 19.			
Precinct 1 .....	18	126	284
“ 2 .....	17	131	250
“ 3 .....	23	89	411
“ 4 .....	19	111	338
“ 5 .....	18	138	201
“ 6 .....	25	155	263
“ 7 .....	27	139	435
“ 8 .....	41	120	348
Totals .....	188	1,009	2,530
Grand totals .....	265	3,071	3,155

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## SIXTH DISTRICT.

Ward 11.	JULIAN CODMAN, Dem.	GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1 .....	104	246	
“ 2 .....	148	207	
“ 3 .....	170	205	
“ 4 .....	230	197	
“ 5 .....	169	143	
“ 6 .....	69	193	
“ 7 .....	72	265	
“ 8 .....	130	167	
“ 9 .....	86	239	
Totals .....	1,178	1,862	
Ward 25.			
Precinct 1 .....	137	339	
“ 2 .....	76	377	1
“ 3 .....	68	301	
“ 4 .....	214	172	
“ 5 .....	216	223	
“ 6 .....	176	304	
“ 7 .....	269	196	
Totals .....	1,156	1,912	1
Grand totals .....	2,334	3,774	1

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## SEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 12.		JAMES H. DOYLE,* Dem.	CONRAD KERSTEN, Soc. Labor.	ALBERT E. TAYLOR, Rep.
Precinct 1	.....	87	5	298
" 2	.....	73	7	297
" 3	.....	188	4	106
" 4	.....	170	14	228
" 5	.....	140	9	212
" 6	.....	373	21	143
" 7	.....	344	5	104
Totals	.....	1,375	65	1,388
Ward 18.				
Precinct 1	.....	359	21	112
" 2	.....	304	26	129
" 3	.....	207	17	248
" 4	.....	321	14	219
" 5	.....	506	12	91
" 6	.....	379	14	192
Totals	.....	2,076	104	991
Grand totals	.....	3,451	169	2,374

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## EIGHTH DISTRICT.

Ward 14.	GODFREY BECK, Soc. Labor.	JOHN KENEALY, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.	JOSEPH J. NORTON,* Dem.	FRANCIS E. PARK, Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1.....	9	33	443	117	1
“ 2.....	30	46	413	51	
“ 3.....	7	27	232	92	
“ 4.....	14	22	168	167	
“ 5.....	16	32	170	227	
“ 6.....	13	24	166	184	
“ 7.....	21	44	242	184	
“ 8.....	20	29	205	200	
Totals .....	130	257	2,039	1,222	1
Ward 15.					
Precinct 1.....	10	20	137	73	
“ 2.....	17	45	282	46	
“ 3.....	8	36	227	100	
“ 4.....	15	29	201	114	
“ 5.....	14	32	253	99	
“ 6.....	16	22	132	173	
“ 7.....	25	29	201	135	
“ 8.....	22	40	187	125	
Totals .....	127	253	1,620	865	
Grand totals .....	257	510	3,659	2,087	1

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Aldermen, Municipal Election, 1899.

## NINTH DISTRICT.

Ward 16.		WILBUR F. ADAMS,* Rep.	FRANKLIN L. CODMAN,* Rep.	WILLIAM H. COOK, Soc. Labor.	DYER ENGER, Soc. Labor.	PATRICK F. McDONALD, Dem.	JOSEPH T. WALSH, Dem.
Precinct 1.....	133	130	24	19	198	168	
“ 2.....	116	115	16	14	326	263	
“ 3.....	203	207	17	13	333	266	
“ 4.....	298	312	17	30	175	109	
“ 5.....	223	237	11	9	172	124	
“ 6.....	304	305	3	3	117	44	
“ 7.....	175	191	14	7	368	317	
Totals.....	1,452	1,497	102	95	1,689	1,291	
Ward 20.							
Precinct 1.....	352	345	17	13	265	166	
“ 2.....	316	309	11	12	364	201	
“ 3.....	244	227	9	6	274	169	
“ 4.....	140	155	12	10	333	261	
“ 5.....	341	344	13	10	319	209	
“ 6.....	421	411	19	18	253	120	
“ 7.....	378	386	10	9	220	134	
“ 8.....	411	401	12	9	178	103	
Totals.....	2,603	2,578	103	87	2,206	1,363	
Ward 24.							
Precinct 1.....	161	197	10	9	254	192	
“ 2.....	206	231	13	8	201	146	
“ 3.....	357	339	14	12	206	136	
“ 4.....	216	230	7	3	203	133	
“ 5.....	263	229	10	2	166	91	
“ 6.....	217	231	12	10	182	147	
“ 7.....	366	365	10	7	155	152	
“ 8.....	428	418	18	24	228	181	
“ 9.....	263	248	63	22	189	126	
Totals.....	2,477	2,488	157	97	1,784	1,304	
Grand totals....	6,532	6,563	362	279	5,679	3,958	

\* Elected.



## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## TENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 17.		JOSEPH BALLAM, Soc. Labor.	DANIEL C. CASEY, Dem.	ROBERT A. JORDAN,* Rep.	AUGUST C. MENDELL, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.
Precinct 1	1	279	66	2	
" 2	7	264	83		
" 3	2	133	224	3	
" 4	3	174	267	7	
" 5	5	245	104	5	
" 6	10	246	63	4	
" 7	9	291	101	1	
" 8	13	317	193	6	
" 9	4	169	210	5	
Totals	54	2,118	1,311	33	
Ward 21.					
Precinct 1	6	124	273	7	
" 2	7	209	235	6	
" 3	6	127	166	3	
" 4	10	118	304	2	
" 5	12	158	260	6	
" 6	6	76	328	4	
" 7	13	234	281	1	
" 8	5	132	379	1	
" 9	8	143	339	3	
Totals	73	1,321	2,565	33	
Grand totals	127	3,439	3,876	66	

\* Elected.

## Votes Cast for Alderman, Municipal Election, 1899.

## ELEVENTH DISTRICT.

Ward 22.	FRANK BOMBACH, Soc. Labor.	JOHN H. BRODERICK, Dem.	E. PEABODY GERRY,* Rep.	RANDOLPH V. KING, Rep. Ind.Nom. Paper.	RICHARD D. SCHMIDT, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper
Precinct 1.....	23	234	288	101	24
“ 2.....	30	297	102	50	18
“ 3.....	11	270	60	34	11
“ 4.....	22	144	236	81	11
“ 5.....	26	182	167	112	22
“ 6.....	14	44	247	59	5
“ 7.....	3	80	294	63	1
“ 8.....	20	225	173	73	9
Totals .....	149	1,476	1,567	573	101

Ward 23.					
Precinct 1.....	6	96	183	32	..
“ 2.....	5	313	91	21	..
“ 3.....	15	253	85	43	6
“ 4.....	11	203	187	39	1
“ 5.....	21	182	270	76	8
“ 6.....	12	80	322	60	7
“ 7.....	9	72	245	45	3
“ 8.....	3	65	314	22	2
“ 9.....	6	118	108	26	2
Totals .....	88	1,382	1,805	364	29
Grand totals.....	237	2,858	3,372	937	130

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal  
Election, 1899.**

<b>Ward 1.</b>		<b>GEORGE H. BATTIS,* Rep.</b>	<b>ROBERT G. DOWNING, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>DAVIS GOLDSTEIN, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>MATHEW D. HEALY, Dem.</b>	<b>WILLIAM B. JACKSON,* Rep.</b>	<b>DAVID W. SIMPSON,* Rep.</b>	<b>JOHN J. SLOAN, Dem.</b>	<b>TERENCE C. TREANOR, Dem.</b>	<b>WILLIAM H. YOUNG, Soc. Labor.</b>
Precinct 1.....		208	8	5	61	204	213	51	54	12
" 2.....		289	10	3	29	278	285	26	23	11
" 3.....		323	11	9	65	327	338	53	56	11
" 4.....		328	7	7	37	317	337	33	34	9
" 5.....		246	11	7	111	245	258	102	96	12
" 6.....		107	14	15	243	94	103	229	223	23
" 7.....		232	15	9	193	223	236	202	207	18
" 8.....		171	19	14	217	177	165	224	231	24
" 9.....		121	11	8	34	118	121	35	30	8
Totals .....		2,025	106	77	990	1,983	2,056	955	954	128

\* Elected.

<b>Ward 2.</b>		<b>JACOB M. FREEDMAN, Rep.</b>	<b>WM. C. S. HEALEY,* Dem.</b>	<b>CLARENCE C. HORS- FORD, Rep.</b>	<b>FRANK J. JOHNSON,* Dem.</b>	<b>PAUL K. OLUFSON, Rep.</b>	<b>ALEXANDER ROBINSON, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>DANIEL J. SHEEHAN,* Dem.</b>	<b>MARITZ WEISS, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>Scattering.</b>
Precinct 1.....		70	340	68	299	55	23	289	21	1
" 2.....		61	236	59	235	57	18	215	12	
" 3.....		103	268	125	256	96	27	242	6	
" 4.....		77	294	64	270	57	14	255	11	
" 5.....		55	245	56	227	49	17	227	12	
" 6.....		98	246	109	229	91	18	232	10	
" 7.....		48	379	52	351	42	20	355	11	
" 8.....		95	357	72	360	64	23	350	15	
Totals .....		607	2,365	605	2,227	511	160	2,165	98	1

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal Election, 1899.**

<b>Ward 3.</b>	<b>WILLIAM J. CARLEY,* Dem.</b>	<b>FRANK J. DOHERTY,* Dem.</b>	<b>JOHN H. FARNSWORTH, Rep.</b>	<b>CHAS. A. HERRIGAN,* Dem.</b>	<b>FRED'K A. MOULTON, Rep.</b>	<b>GEORGE H. ROBBINS, Rep.</b>
Precinct <b>1</b> .....	116	117	219	114	228	227
“ <b>2</b> .....	330	319	116	293	121	113
“ <b>3</b> .....	237	235	127	223	133	127
“ <b>4</b> .....	451	431	46	401	44	45
“ <b>5</b> .....	362	366	69	363	66	56
“ <b>6</b> .....	314	320	59	304	28	27
<b>Totals</b> .....	1,810	1,788	636	1,698	620	595

\* Elected.

<b>Ward 4.</b>	<b>TOBIAS BECK, Rep.</b>	<b>CHARLES A. BLETHEN, Rep.</b>	<b>GEORGE H. CADIGAN,* Dem.</b>	<b>PRENTICE L. GARLAND, Rep.</b>	<b>J. ANDERSON HYDE, Rep. Ind. Nom. Paper.</b>	<b>THOMAS A. KELLEY,* Dem.</b>	<b>JOHN P. SULLIVAN,* Dem.</b>
Precinct <b>1</b> .....	92	75	271	79	13	290	267
“ <b>2</b> .....	171	164	106	161	11	102	94
“ <b>3</b> .....	180	178	199	191	21	186	192
“ <b>4</b> .....	109	96	240	114	11	236	236
“ <b>5</b> .....	42	40	295	44	5	287	317
“ <b>6</b> .....	110	120	165	107	10	152	169
<b>Totals</b> .....	704	673	1,276	696	71	1,253	1,275

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal  
Election, 1899.**

Ward 5.		ARTHUR W. DOLAN,* Dem.	JOHN F. GIBBONS,* Dem.	JAMES HARVEY, Rep.	JOHN C. HURLEY,* Dem.	GEORGE P. PORTER, Rep.	JOSEPH L. SACKETT, Soc. Labor.	WILLIAM A. SARGENT, Rep.
Precinct 1	130	113	207	128	203	10	201	
“ 2	277	247	138	276	122	17	123	
“ 3	312	289	34	348	33	15	30	
“ 4	174	150	105	156	103	16	104	
“ 5	336	296	103	282	97	22	87	
“ 6	230	201	89	218	91	12	89	
Totals	1,459	1,296	676	1,408	649	92	634	

\* Elected.

Ward 6.											
ANDREW A. BADARACCO,* Dem.		PATRICK H. BRADLEY,* Dem.		WILLIAM H. BRADLEY, Rep.		MARTIN B. COOK, Rep.		MANUEL P. DAVIS, Rep.		THOMAS J. GRADY,* Dem.	
MORRIS KAPLAN, Soc. Labor.		ABRAHAM KORNETZ, Soc. Lab.		JOHN T. O'BRIEN, Dem. Labor Nom. Paper.		WILLIAM H. O'BRIEN, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.		WILLIAM J. O'BRIEN, Dem. Labor Nom. Paper.			
Precinct 1..	160	162	45	23	28	167	4	3	8	13	171
“ 2..	267	286	60	22	26	290	10	10	13	12	149
“ 3..	248	221	77	32	44	211	16	11	8	13	160
“ 4..	206	199	49	14	19	181	11	6	14	19	151
“ 5..	239	208	103	78	71	168	27	19	17	12	148
“ 6..	53	68	144	158	141	62	10	5	6	2	22
“ 7..	209	212	76	53	56	167	28	23	24	22	141
“ 8..	182	240	21	7	7	180	11	6	16	14	124
Totals ...	1,564	1,596	575	387	392	1,426	117	83	106	107	1,066

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal Election, 1899.**

Ward 7.		EDWARD T. BARNES, Rep.	DANIEL J. DONNELLY,* Dem.	EDGAR B. ELLSWORTH, Rep.	PATRICK MAHONEY, Soc. Labor.	WILLIAM PEEL, Dem. Labor Nom. Paper.	LEWIS PENNINI, Rep.	JAMES H. STONE,* Dem.	JOHN L. SULLIVAN, Dem.	JAMES A. SWEENEY,* Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.
Precinct 1	1	105	100	106	18	14	104	94	91	67
" 2	2	74	89	63	15	13	56	164	103	227
" 3	3	100	152	89	28	26	93	139	166	111
" 4	4	98	55	115	7	8	119	42	76	86
" 5	5	18	271	22	23	15	31	247	241	216
" 6	6	26	255	34	10	13	30	304	182	163
Totals.....		421	922	429	101	89	433	990	859	870

\* Elected.

Ward 8.		LAWRENCE J. AGNEW, Rep. Cit. Nom. Paper.	WILLIAM E. ANDREWS, Rep.	WILLIAM A. BATES, Rep. Cit. Nom. Paper.	CHARLES M. BURTON, Rep. Cit. Nom. Paper.	NATHAN FINESTONE, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	HARRY GORDON, Rep.	MICHAEL F. HART,* Dem.	DANIEL J. KILEY,* Dem.	MARTIN LEFTOVITH,* Dem.	ABE LEVIN, Soc. Labor.	BENJAMIN RAMIN, Dem. Soc. Nom. Paper.	HARRY SHERMAN, Soc. Labor.	MEYER TAFSHINSKY, Soc. Labor.
Precinct 1	1	20	34	11	11	26	111	358	363	376	20	25	30	19
" 2	2	33	99	57	23	17	111	259	252	227	19	11	23	10
" 3	3	65	221	164	65	12	171	85	95	62	12	14	4	4
" 4	4	25	90	33	22	33	151	358	349	349	19	27	20	13
" 5	5	10	72	39	11	45	203	339	326	366	39	37	33	25
" 6	6	31	106	40	26	25	189	369	354	338	22	18	29	22
Totals....		184	622	344	158	158	936	1,768	1,739	1,718	131	132	139	93

\* Elected.

### Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal Election, 1899.

Ward 9.		SAMUEL ASCHER, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.		HENRY C. CLAXTON, Rep.		CHARLES S. COWANS, Rep. Hart Nom. Paper.		FRANK H. COWIN, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.		DANIEL L. FLANAGAN,* Dem.		D. FRANK FORD, Rep.		GEORGE GIGUERE, Soc. Labor.		JOHN GRISHAVER, Soc. Labor.		SAMUEL KASANOF,* Dem.		PETER S. RING, Dem. Ind. Nom. Paper.		JAY ROBERT SIMMONS, Soc. Labor.		JOHN J. TOBIN,* Dem.	
Precinct 1.....	26	93	59	28	212	84	30	30	232	76	33	226													
" 2.....	44	84	77	32	246	89	20	27	195	114	21	257													
" 3.....	32	5	7	19	295	3	19	21	245	165	16	272													
" 4.....	28	96	103	30	223	105	26	22	192	123	26	218													
" 5.....	45	179	135	20	125	173	15	23	99	44	21	113													
" 6.....	15	156	118	20	82	163	20	18	51	37	19	81													
" 7.....	13	69	43	50	263	51	7	1	164	174	8	263													
Totals.....	203	682	542	199	1,446	668	137	142	1,178	733	144	1,430													

\* Elected.

Ward 10.		JAMES A. BRESNAHAN, Soc. Labor.		JOHN J. GILLESPIE, Rep. Ind. Nom. Paper.		ALFRED F. KINNEY,* Rep.		WALTER RALPH- MANSFIELD,* Rep.		OSBORN ARTHUR NEWTON,* Rep.		TIMOTHY O'SULLIVAN, Dem.		SAMUEL TROEDER, Dem.	
Precinct 1.....	42	30	89	88	82	137	121								
" 2.....	28	49	166	170	150	105	80								
" 3.....	26	61	167	161	141	44	38								
" 4.....	22	91	173	186	154	26	25								
" 5.....	9	43	151	145	149	23	28								
" 6.....	18	90	228	234	180	34	38								
" 7.....	21	87	348	372	299	51	55								
" 8.....	40	118	330	353	258	91	95								
" 9.....	17	37	211	217	180	41	48								
Totals.....	223	606	1,863	1,926	1,593	552	528								

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal  
Election, 1899.**

<b>Ward 11.</b>		<b>EDWARD A. ARMIS- TEAD,* Rep.</b>	<b>HOLLIS FRENCH, Dem.</b>	<b>WILLIAM S. MITCHELL, Dem.</b>	<b>WALTER H. REYNOLDS, Dem.</b>	<b>WILLIAM S. B. STEVENS,* Rep.</b>	<b>LAWRENCE M. STOCK- TON,* Rep.</b>
Precinct 1.....		226	103	81	89	246	245
" 2.....		222	129	133	122	175	174
" 3.....		180	171	157	148	189	193
" 4.....		182	236	126	147	245	283
" 5.....		134	173	38	82	216	264
" 6.....		167	98	31	55	205	219
" 7.....		204	123	36	61	261	288
" 8.....		140	148	24	69	219	255
" 9.....		213	95	29	64	250	279
Totals.....		1,668	1,276	655	837	2,006	2,200

\* Elected.

<b>Ward 12.</b>		<b>SAMUEL D. BASCH, Dem.</b>	<b>RICHARD T. HARRIS, Dem.</b>	<b>BENHARD JOHNSON, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>DONALD N. MacDON- ALD,* Rep.</b>	<b>JOSEPH I. McLAUGH- LIN, Dem.</b>	<b>ARTHUR K. PECK,* Rep.</b>	<b>HARRY S. UPHAM,* Rep.</b>	<b>WILLIAM R. WILSON, Soc. Labor.</b>
Precinct 1.....		71	61	8	307	58	299	290	6
" 2.....		71	55	15	289	43	306	289	14
" 3.....		147	140	9	168	134	166	156	8
" 4.....		131	127	22	253	124	249	244	17
" 5.....		106	98	26	216	104	230	220	17
" 6.....		327	295	34	163	297	168	159	32
" 7.....		257	231	23	134	231	140	130	19
Totals.....		1,110	1,007	137	1,530	991	1,558	1,488	113

\* Elected.



**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal  
Election, 1899.**

<b>Ward 13.</b>		DANIEL CARROLL, D. I. N. P.		HENRY C. CLEMENTS, Rep.		TIMOTHY DRISCOLL, Soc. Labor.		JOSEPH GERRIOR, Soc. Labor.		LAWRENCE J. KELLY,* Dem.		FRANK J. LINEHAN,* Dem.		JOHN E. L. MONAGHAN,* Dem.		HUBERT PARRO, Soc. Labor.		ALBERT D. PARSONS, Rep.		JAMES F. PRESTON, Rep.	
Precinct 1	27	22	31	17	287	267	249	13	16	18											
" 2	64	19	29	14	349	266	248	17	15	19											
" 3	29	15	18	17	274	279	245	14	11	13											
" 4	32	36	19	12	284	280	268	12	34	34											
" 5	34	39	26	20	269	264	258	18	33	32											
" 6	39	52	25	14	197	201	184	14	48	30											
" 7	64	17	19	15	290	269	264	11	19	23											
" 8	23	24	16	21	243	232	227	14	19	20											
Totals	312	224	183	130	2,193	2,058	1,943	113	195	189											

\* Elected.

<b>Ward 14.</b>		GEORGE A. DONAHOE,* Dem.		WALTER W. FRISBEE, Rep.		FREDERICK D. LAWLEY, Rep.		HENRY LITHAUER, Soc. Labor.		EDWARD L. LOGAN,* Dem.		J. FRANK O'HARE,* Dem.		GEORGE F. ROBBINS, Rep.	
Precinct 1	429	113	113	26	434	430	114								
" 2	427	56	44	35	424	439	43								
" 3	226	91	90	14	239	245	97								
" 4	152	182	185	14	169	162	175								
" 5	188	224	210	33	198	184	209								
" 6	164	195	193	21	172	163	184								
" 7	270	183	188	30	224	264	167								
" 8	212	189	202	29	230	222	171								
Totals	2,068	1,233	1,225	202	2,090	2,109	1,160								

\* Elected.

### Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal Election, 1899.

Ward 15.		JULIUS AARON, Soc. Labor.	CORNELIUS BECHT- HOLDT, Soc. Labor.	JOHN D. FENTON,* Dem.	JOSEPH P. FOLEY, Soc. Labor.	JOHN H. GIBLIN,* Dem.	HORACE M. GREER, Rep.	WILLIAM T. HAYNES, Rep.	CHARLES D. SMITH, Rep.	WILLIAM L. WHITE,* Dem.
Precinct 1.....	8	10	166	15	139	56	58	60	137	
" 2.....	15	17	304	28	311	28	29	28	326	
" 3.....	21	16	238	23	241	75	76	82	260	
" 4.....	10	9	210	23	230	98	95	96	230	
" 5.....	17	15	244	51	269	88	92	111	227	
" 6.....	13	12	144	15	161	161	161	166	149	
" 7.....	30	25	191	58	200	123	114	123	177	
" 8.....	26	18	213	62	207	114	103	113	192	
Totals.....	140	122	1,710	275	1,758	743	728	779	1,698	

\* Elected.

Ward 16.		FRANK S. ATWOOD,* Rep.	DAVID CALLAHAN, Dem.	GEORGE S. DENSMORE, Soc. Labor.	WILLIAM H. GAVIN, Dem.	WILLIAM MCG. GRANT,* Rep.	OSCAR R. OSTBERG, Soc. Labor.	MICHAEL I. TULLY, Dem.	FRANK E. WELLS,* Rep.	Scattering.
Precinct 1	137	180	38	185	119	33	164	117		
" 2	114	262	35	290	127	37	247	115	3	
" 3	203	272	27	291	224	27	256	194		
" 4	329	130	22	139	294	40	118	326		
" 5	233	158	15	142	205	11	138	238		
" 6	330	48	9	52	316	4	40	332		
" 7	187	327	22	304	165	16	352	169		
Totals		1,533	1,377	168	1,403	1,450	168	1,315	1,491	3

\* Elected.

**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal  
Election, 1899.**

<b>Ward 17.</b>	<b>WILLIAM H. AMES, Rep.</b>	<b>TIMOTHY L. CONNOLLY,* Dem.</b>	<b>JAMES M. CURLEY,* Dem.</b>	<b>GEORGE A. FLYNN,* Dem.</b>	<b>BYRAM W. HATCH, Rep.</b>	<b>ALFRED R. MITCHELL, Rep.</b>
Precinct 1 .....	53	236	274	235	46	55
" 2 .....	61	238	254	250	59	69
" 3 .....	188	149	138	138	184	191
" 4 .....	232	195	179	186	225	231
" 5 .....	88	220	249	248	85	87
" 6 .....	43	217	251	273	36	46
" 7 .....	64	264	295	304	70	70
" 8 .....	159	295	318	358	150	157
" 9 .....	189	167	176	191	186	181
<b>Totals .....</b>	<b>1,077</b>	<b>1,981</b>	<b>2,134</b>	<b>2,183</b>	<b>1,041</b>	<b>1,087</b>

\* Elected.

<b>Ward 18.</b>	<b>CHARLES H. BARKER, Rep.</b>	<b>JOHN J. CURLEY,* Dem.</b>	<b>WILLIAM E. GOOD,* Dem.</b>	<b>MICHAEL W. KELLEY,* Dem.</b>	<b>JOHN J. McALDUFF, Rep.</b>	<b>CHARLES O. NORD- LING, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>THOMAS W. PRITCH- ARD, Rep.</b>	<b>SVEN A. RYDWALL, Soc. Labor.</b>	<b>CARL SCHLUTER, Soc. Labor.</b>
Precinct 1 .....	101	333	338	292	98	42	85	22	27
" 2 .....	126	269	269	248	101	31	105	32	30
" 3 .....	235	199	190	186	211	27	217	25	23
" 4 .....	219	277	272	249	200	43	195	27	27
" 5 .....	88	406	394	433	68	18	70	18	19
" 6 .....	186	339	347	329	160	24	169	24	24
<b>Totals .....</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>1,823</b>	<b>1,810</b>	<b>1,737</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>841</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>150</b>

\* Elected.


**Votes Cast for Members of Common Council, Municipal Election, 1899.**

<b>Ward 19.</b>		WILLIAM H. DOYLE,* Dem.	LYMAN C. FISHER, Rep.	FRANK J. GRUNER, JR., Rep.	WILLIAM O'S. HEN- NIGAN,* Dem.	JAMES MCINERNEY,* Dem.	ALBERT F. NORRIS, Rep.	C. ARVID OLSON, Soc. Labor.
Precinct	<b>1</b> .....	265	111	108	263	261	104	21
"	<b>2</b> .....	272	102	94	226	230	92	29
"	<b>3</b> .....	392	52	49	378	404	47	38
"	<b>4</b> .....	348	88	84	321	329	84	30
"	<b>5</b> .....	210	127	114	180	188	118	22
"	<b>6</b> .....	265	157	142	245	229	147	35
"	<b>7</b> .....	415	124	122	396	400	120	44
"	<b>8</b> .....	313	94	85	378	290	79	41
<b>Totals</b> .....		2,480	855	798	2,387	2,331	791	260

\* Elected.

<b>Ward 20.</b>		OLIVER S. DAVEN- PORT,* Rep.	MAURICE S. FITZGER- ALD, Dem.	JOHN FULTON, JR., Dem.	JOHN P. HATCH, Dem.	GEORGE R. MILLER,* Rep.	AXEL KONRAD PETER- SON, Soc. Labor.	GEORGE O. WOOD,* Rep.
Precinct	<b>1</b> .....	378	186	178	211	363	22	351
"	<b>2</b> .....	367	237	220	224	351	22	345
"	<b>3</b> .....	265	207	201	191	252	10	250
"	<b>4</b> .....	147	317	286	265	140	15	141
"	<b>5</b> .....	359	256	245	241	351	18	348
"	<b>6</b> .....	471	153	148	138	464	38	437
"	<b>7</b> .....	415	144	148	159	406	18	394
"	<b>8</b> .....	442	112	111	109	426	20	428
<b>Totals</b> .....		2,844	1,612	1,537	1,538	2,753	163	2,694

\* Elected.



Wards.	Precinct 1.				Precinct 2.				Precinct 3.				Precinct 4.				Precinct 5.			
	Patrick A. Collins.	Thomas N. Hart.	John W. Sherman.	James F. Stevens.	Patrick A. Collins.	Thomas N. Hart.	John W. Sherman.	James F. Stevens.	Patrick A. Collins.	Thomas N. Hart.	John W. Sherman.	James F. Stevens.	Patrick A. Collins.	Thomas N. Hart.	John W. Sherman.	James F. Stevens.	Patrick A. Collins.	Thomas N. Hart.	John W. Sherman.	James F. Stevens.
1.....	61	228	2	1	36	302	....	4	85	352	1	1	53	339	2	2	123	277	4	4
2.....	284	152	8	5	199	113	6	5	256	163	1	....	273	127	10	7	237	103	4	4
3.....	96	274	2	1	276	204	4	3	195	202	6	2	387	150	1	1	306	177	1	1
4.....	209	181	4	2	78	212	2	....	156	262	3	4	226	154	4	4	238	136	3	3
5.....	104	268	3	....	248	204	1	2	292	128	2	2	161	146	3	3	258	127	5	5
6.....	241	101	....	1	337	119	4	3	264	161	5	4	254	119	4	5	275	187	5	5
7.....	122	143	1	4	156	205	7	2	191	172	5	7	80	167	5	2	331	120	6	6
8.....	413	87	18	11	244	160	12	9	101	250	9	3	367	158	26	9	387	146	238	238
9.....	290	149	19	12	299	158	7	9	393	47	9	7	278	179	9	13	152	235	6	6
10.....	142	108	6	6	93	204	3	1	56	181	4	4	33	215	3	2	33	166	2	2
11.....	92	253	1	6	126	224	3	5	158	215	....	2	180	241	1	....	101	204	....	....
12.....	88	299	2	2	71	303	3	3	143	185	4	....	137	285	3	3	108	250	4	4
13.....	323	89	5	6	324	87	3	5	321	68	2	2	338	86	7	....	283	107	9	9
14.....	419	181	4	7	422	97	12	11	215	135	7	4	160	206	3	9	174	266	7	7
15.....	127	106	1	4	278	105	5	8	234	127	....	7	197	149	9	4	234	165	4	4
16.....	175	173	1	12	267	173	5	6	276	262	2	8	132	347	9	1	139	268	2	2
17.....	228	119	1	2	237	106	5	4	147	207	3	4	180	272	7	2	221	132	1	1
18.....	296	183	4	12	270	164	7	15	178	283	4	10	243	290	13	13	436	161	7	7
19.....	268	146	6	10	243	138	1	10	409	97	4	12	328	127	7	11	206	146	7	7
20.....	214	382	4	5	248	375	5	3	213	269	2	....	288	187	6	3	243	394	5	5
21.....	126	281	8	3	214	244	7	4	121	172	5	4	124	304	3	4	161	263	4	4
22.....	248	408	18	14	294	178	16	21	274	111	6	9	136	344	7	19	174	291	530	530
23.....	111	201	1	2	279	148	1	1	247	139	11	9	203	231	3	4	169	374	701	701
24.....	222	206	1	3	168	239	2	6	168	376	5	4	145	271	4	1	112	285	2	2
25.....	135	335	5	2	87	368	4	1	65	304	4	2	222	160	9	6	214	221	3	3
Grand Totals.....																				

Propor  
D., signifies Democratic. R., Repu

Mayor, Municipal Election, 1899.

[illegible]

\* Elected.

of men registered who voted, 77.15 per cent.

\* Elected.

of men registered who voted for mayor, 79.07 per cent.

6. D. S. N. P., Democratic Social Nomination Paper. S. L., Socialist Labor.

11

1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
17  
1  
1  
2  
2  
2  
2  
2  
2  
—

==



**Number of Women Registered who Voted for School Committee**  
 (AS PER WARD OFFICERS' RETURNS OF NAMES CHECKED ON  
 VOTING LISTS) AT MUNICIPAL ELECTION, 1899.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Number of names checked.	Number regis- tered.	Per cent. regis- tered who voted.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.			
1 .....	57	85	95	72	62	6	19	17	6	419	611	68.58
2 .....	12	14	10	17	10	17	6	2	....	88	124	70.97
3 .....	81	30	40	11	14	14	....	....	....	190	276	68.84
4 .....	23	47	53	28	6	12	....	....	....	169	279	60.57
5 .....	35	28	5	10	20	9	....	....	....	107	187	57.22
6 .....	2	7	6	2	11	13	4	1	....	46	90	51.11
7 .....	11	14	20	14	23	16	....	....	....	98	145	67.59
8 .....	1	13	35	10	7	20	....	....	....	86	139	61.87
9 .....	8	10	3	8	45	50	6	....	....	130	211	61.61
10 .....	13	23	39	34	16	43	74	39	27	308	476	64.71
11 .....	69	12	96	87	81	68	77	80	50	620	800	77.50
12 .....	84	94	45	61	27	30	27	....	....	368	550	66.91
13 .....	3	10	5	9	6	21	8	4	....	66	121	54.55
14 .....	29	9	34	47	78	48	42	22	....	309	471	65.61
15 .....	11	15	25	59	37	80	48	17	....	292	453	64.46
16 .....	31	26	37	61	49	91	25	....	....	320	446	71.75
17 .....	4	11	60	71	10	2	22	32	25	237	344	68.90
18 .....	22	22	28	38	6	56	....	....	....	172	240	71.67
19 .....	13	24	2	24	29	27	28	8	....	155	230	67.39
20 .....	75	103	63	43	58	75	106	74	....	597	876	68.15
21 .....	62	47	35	96	70	104	50	117	70	651	890	73.15
22 .....	55	12	19	51	18	55	89	34	....	333	446	74.66
23 .....	58	6	13	23	54	61	62	57	10	344	547	62.89
24 .....	39	38	94	47	64	51	122	92	48	595	828	71.86
25 .....	56	76	99	14	37	68	40	....	..	390	605	64.46
Totals,	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	....	7,090	10,385	

Proportion of women registered who voted, 68.27 per cent.

**Votes Cast on the Question: Shall Chapter 398 of the Acts of the Year 1899, entitled "An Act to Authorize the Replacing of Street Car Tracks on Boylston and Tremont Streets, in the City of Boston," Be Accepted?—Municipal Election, 1899.**

Wards.	Yes.	No.
1 .....	1,871	1,408
2 .....	1,895	1,198
3 .....	925	1,600
4 .....	834	1,255
5 .....	845	1,422
6 .....	1,274	1,480
7 .....	655	1,198
8 .....	882	1,995
9 .....	901	1,945
10 .....	853	1,846
11 .....	547	2,431
12 .....	963	1,880
13 .....	1,204	1,675
14 .....	1,065	2,497
15 .....	717	2,068
16 .....	795	2,357
17 .....	1,057	2,306
18 .....	1,240	1,802
19 .....	1,249	2,385
20 .....	1,146	3,458
21 .....	1,426	2,576
22 .....	1,103	2,776
23 .....	944	2,678
24 .....	936	3,218
25 .....	839	2,189
Totals.....	26,166	51,643

Proportion of men registered who voted, 75.63 per cent.

## Number of Men Registered Who Voted

(AS PER WARD OFFICERS' RETURNS OF NAMES CHECKED  
ON VOTING LISTS) AT MUNICIPAL ELECTION, 1899.

Wards.	PRECINCTS.									Number of names checked.	Number regis- tered.	Per cent. regis- tered who voted.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.			
1..	297	343	443	401	411	414	510	477	191	3,487	4,190	83.22
2..	467	335	431	422	355	394	497	548	....	3,449	4,189	82.33
3..	384	495	416	557	504	406	....	....	....	2,762	3,345	82.57
4..	406	300	429	403	399	312	....	....	....	2,249	2,759	81.52
5..	378	458	442	319	476	357	....	...	....	2,430	3,045	79.80
6..	359	480	456	402	487	259	454	349	....	3,246	4,427	73.32
7..	273	375	384	262	470	428	....	....	....	2,192	2,730	80.29
8..	540	438	365	570	614	598	....	....	....	3,125	3,832	81.55
9..	484	493	471	492	401	307	495	....	....	3,143	3,959	79.39
10..	274	312	251	264	212	311	453	495	283	2,855	3,881	73.56
11..	361	383	392	433	314	268	343	306	330	3,130	3,891	80.44
12..	400	387	342	434	378	554	469	....	....	2,964	3,828	77.43
13..	435	432	403	439	413	350	434	364	....	3,270	4,027	81.20
14..	629	556	365	381	464	401	506	478	....	3,780	4,584	82.46
15..	247	409	382	365	412	355	403	390	....	2,963	3,837	77.22
16..	370	465	559	500	422	409	594	....	....	3,319	4,097	81.01
17..	366	372	366	465	370	347	412	539	392	3,629	4,381	82.83
18..	507	478	488	567	629	601	....	....	....	3,270	4,139	79.00
19..	442	415	541	491	371	465	621	535	....	3,881	4,676	83.00
20..	611	649	496	503	657	666	600	592	....	4,774	5,915	80.71
21..	428	477	310	444	443	426	550	536	510	4,124	4,959	83.16
22..	697	520	415	519	530	382	444	529	....	4,036	4,887	82.59
23..	318	449	424	458	585	496	383	417	277	3,807	4,347	87.58
24..	446	424	565	426	408	424	551	674	476	4,394	5,244	83.79
25..	492	465	380	407	450	493	480	....	....	3,167	3,706	85.46
Totals .....										83,446	102,875	

Proportion of men registered who voted, 81.11 per cent.

### Inventory of Property Belonging to or Used by the Election Department.

- 103 Voting booths made of thin corrugated steel, built in 1897 and 1898.
- 20 Wooden voting booths built in 1898 as permanent structures.
- 34 Old wooden voting booths, known as "knock-down" buildings.


The above booths when not in use are stored at different places in the city. Two additional old wooden booths, not removed from locations, are also used as polling places. To each booth belong railings and voting compartments, tables, chairs, stove and other necessary furnishings and voting paraphernalia. The department now owns 1,654 chairs, 744 tables, 554 voting compartments and 1,106 wooden horses for the same, 200 stools for ballot-boxes, 196 counting boards, 174 stoves and the required lamps, coal-hods, shovels, pokers, coal-barrels and other minor equipment for the voting booths.

Many of the old wooden voting booths were loaned in former years, by order of the Mayor, to other departments of the city. Seventeen of these have not been returned, and are charged to the following departments: Health Department, 1; Street Department, 1; Bath Department, 13; City Hospital, 2. Of the booths loaned to the State in 1898, two were not returned; a fair value for the same has been paid to the city.

- 185 Federal ballot-boxes, mostly in fair condition, used at elections.
- 25 United States ballot-boxes, comparatively new, used for caucuses.
- 25 Standard ballot-boxes, formerly used at caucuses, and now used as "extras" at caucuses and elections.
- 29 Acme ballot-boxes, 6 of which are regularly used at elections and the balance as "extras" at caucuses and elections.

All of the above are kept in the basement room in the Old Court House. At the store-house in South Boston are 277 old ballot-boxes, not answering the present requirements of law, but placed at each polling-place at elections for temporary use in case of emergency; also 108 old revolving ballot-boxes, not now of any available use.

Office furniture in Rooms 1, 2, 8 and 9, Old Court House, used as the offices of the department, consisting of 8 roll-top desks, 8 swivel chairs for the same, and 23 smaller swivel chairs, 1 library table and 5 library chairs, 2 atlas cases, 1 metal filing case, 1 card index cabinet, 1 roll-front document case, 1 wardrobe, 1 coat-rack, 4 long tables, 2 counters, 1 typewriting table, 1 large iron safe, 3 small tables, 4 clocks, metal frame rack in one of large vaults for holding caucus and election cardboard boxes (about 500 in number), and books, stationery, and required minor furnishings and fixtures for office purposes.





B. P. L. Bindery.  
DEC 26 1911

FRAGILE

DO NOT  
PHOTOCOPY